ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΩΝ

Δ, Ε, Ζ

ΜΕΛΠΟΜΕΝΗ ΤΕΡΨΙΧΟΡΗ ΕΡΑΤΩ

HERODOTUS

THE FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH BOOKS

WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, APPENDICES,
INDICES, MAPS

BY

REGINALD WALTER MACAN, M.A.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD
AND UNIVERSITY READER IN ANCIENT HISTORY

VOL. I

INTRODUCTION, TEXT WITH NOTES

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK
1895

PREFACE

In these two volumes is comprised the major instalment of a work, which should present at least the last six Books of Herodotus, duly annotated and explained. By this issue the editor discharges the heavier portion of his covenanted labours. The task has been long a-doing, hindered and interrupted, as it has been, by sufficient causes, which here to specify further might seem to be assuming a too general expectancy of the book. Enough now, if some friends, interested in the progress of this work, be not disappointed in its execution; and if the public, a somewhat critical one, to which it appeals, find it, upon the whole, serviceable and welcome.

The increase of materials and the rising standard of method will presently render it well-nigh desperate for any one man to elaborate a complete edition of *Herodotus* upon the scale of former editors. One must needs be not merely grammarian and historian, but archaeologist, anthropologist, philosopher and something more to boot, in order adequately to explain and illustrate 'the Father of History,' his work. The next commentary on 'The Muses,' intended for scholars at large, will haply be undertaken by a syndicate, or trust, in which each department of the Herodotean Museum may be headed by an all-competent sub-specialist. But, even then, a controlling mind will be necessary in order to bring consistency and point to the result: meanwhile there is a chance that this edition may still be in time to invest the middle section of the Herodotean *Histories* with *Introduction*, *Commentary* and

Appendices, not all unworthy, having regard to the present state of knowledge and research, a place beside the accomplished labours of a less exacting age.

The more precise relations of this edition to those others cannot be described in a sentence. Whatever may now be the right estimate of works even as recent as those of Larcher and of Schweighäuser, no competent judge will expect to find a claim here advanced to supersede the commentaries of Baehr, of Blakesley, of Rawlinson, of Stein, each of which has merits, visible, even in this very edition, by derivation or deposit. Of any preponderant debt to this one or that of his predecessors the present editor is scarcely conscious. The extent to which antecedent labours support his own, is attested, perhaps too scrupulously, twice over, in the Notes *passim* and in the Index of Authors, *sub nominibus*. Though the references there accumulated betoken not seldom dissent or criticism, they are none the less indicative of obligations incurred. A similar canon applies to the works of the historians, Grote, Thirlwall, Curtius, Duncker, Busolt, Eduard Meyer and others, and, in short, to all the modern authorities at all copiously cited. If the writer were conscious of a primary nexus to one or other of his many creditors, this would be the place to acknowledge it. Let critics, if they please, discover his scientific pedigree, if he have one. His first claim is to have focussed a good number of results, many of which are virtually common property in the Republic of Hellenic Studies, enforcing them by methods, to the development of which schools of recent and living investigators have contributed. He has taken some pleasure in accentuating the English contribution to the common stock; but no one using these volumes will accuse him of disguising his obligation to foreign sources. Throughout, properties have been, to the best of his ability, assigned to the rightful owners, after the example of that truly classic plagiary, who plundered his friends only to give them back their goods, on the principle that *men thank you more for restoring to them what is their own, than if you had never robbed them at all.* It would, however,

be an excess of altruism, on the writer's part, to announce these volumes as the mere exploitation of other men's labours. So far as he is aware, no previous commentary has applied so completely the methods of analytic and discriminative criticism to the work of Herodotus. Consequently, this edition should exhibit more fully than others the structure and composition of the Herodotean opus, should discover more systematically the problems of origin and source, and should appreciate more nicely the varying values of the different parts, paragraphs, and items, of the multifarious and complex whole. Two cases, *exempli gratia*, may here—not without some risk—be named in support of this claim. Though the geography of Herodotus has been discussed again and again, the composite and unsystematic quality of the Herodotean world has not been so distinctly presented as it is in this work. Again, though scholars and historians might seem by this time to have said the last word about the battle of Marathon, the genesis and progress of the story itself appear never to have been so fully considered as in the present work. That consideration, though in the first instance a literary exercise, is none the less an essential preliminary to a definitive solution of the real problems at issue. And so forth, in other cases.

This work makes no claim to multiply paradoxes. It was no slight satisfaction to find, in the fourth volume of the collected and posthumous *Kleine Schriften* of an illustrious savant, Alfred von Gutschmid, published only in 1894, an *Index Fontium* and an *Oekonomie* to the work of Herodotus, anticipating to some extent, and confirming, observations and methods advocated in the *Introduction* to these volumes, which was then already in type. The laureate work of a well-known French Hellenist, M. Hauvette, appeared after the second of these volumes was already in the printer's hands, or account would naturally have been taken of his labours. It is some comfort to reflect that his masterly support may be utilised in the production of the portion of this work still remaining to do. An identical remark applies to the researches of an American scholar, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth,

upon the Ionic dialect, to which here appeal can be made only in support of observations upon the Herodotean style printed on pp. cxvii, cxx of this volume. It is matter for congratulation that no results, however startling, brought by Mr. Arthur Evans from Krete, or by Professor Flinders Petrie from Egypt, are likely to invalidate the utterances in these volumes in regard to the problems of Hellenic *origines*, or of Libyan ethnology.

It remains to acknowledge gratefully assistance given from time to time towards the production of this work. Professor Ramsay, Professor Percy Gardner, Mr. Mackinder, Mr. Walker, and other Oxford colleagues, have kindly replied to inquiries, or afforded light, on points of detail. Other scholars (whom the editor is proud to claim, in one sense or other, as 'old pupils') have laid him under various obligations. Professor Titchener, now of Cornell University, made an observation embodied in a note to 5. 55, 3. A large debt to Mr. Hogarth is fully set out in Appendix XIII. § 9. Without a suggestion, volunteered by Mr. Arnold C. Taylor of Uppingham, the last Appendix would probably never have been written. Mr. Tracey of Brasenose College kindly read some of the earlier proofs of the Greek text. The first and second *Indices* are mainly the work of Mr. A. S. L. Farquharson of University College. Other services, not here specified, are had in grateful remembrance. The revision of the proof-sheets, as a whole, was a labour too long and exacting to be inflicted upon any friend, however willing. In a work, the mere printing of which has occupied upwards of twenty months, and which combines a very large number and variety of types and symbols, some allowance will be granted for an occasional *lapsus calami* that may have kept its place in type. A few *Corrigenda* will be found after the Table of Contents in each volume.

If irregularities in the Englishing of Greek words and names cause any offence, let them be taken for experimental evidence of a desire to attain the unattainable, to wit, a satisfactory transliteration of Greek forms. For the rest, there has been nothing

detected, up to date, to mislead a competent reader. This result is mainly due to the admirable work done in the printer's office; and if, in other respects, the work issues well-equipped, that shows again the high standard and the ready goodwill of a long-suffering publisher.

R. W. M.

University College, Oxford,
April 1895.

CONTENTS

CORRIGENDA

Pp. 32 b, 84 b *for* Gompertz *read* Gomperz
P. 372 a l. 28 *for* Droysen *read* Delbrück
P. 376 a l. 12 *for* Boedr. *read* Metag.

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. To appreciate the importance of the Greek text, herewith printed and annotated, its relation to the work of Herodotus as a whole must be duly considered. To understand the whole, it is necessary to discover its general structure, and the sections into which it may most usefully be sub-divided. A successful Analysis of the full text is an essential preliminary to a just conception of the problems connected with the sources and the composition of the work, and with the character of the author, whether as historian or as hero. The full exhibition and discussion of those problems should only be attempted when the analytical criticism of the work has been accomplished: this criticism, however, in its progress incidentally tends to define canons and conclusions, which affect the appreciation of the several parts of the work. Thus, although no more than the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus are here immediately under review, they must be considered in the light of principles which are to be gathered from all the nine Books, and cannot be fully verified except by reference to the whole work, and its every part. To enumerate or to discuss these principles in this place would be to open up the whole mass of problems and arguments, which should be reserved as *Prolegomena* to a complete edition of the work. It must suffice to make such assumptions or statements as may be easily verified by a general acquaintance with the whole work, in order to concentrate attention and criticism upon the three Books here printed, and to elucidate their position and import, intrinsically and in relation to the antecedent and succeeding portions of the text. The intrinsic significance of these Books it is the more especial function of the *Notes* and *Appendices* to elucidate: this *Introduction* aims at emphasising the relative bearings of the middle section of the

text upon the two remainders, which it separates, or connects. The distinction between intrinsic and relative importance or interest is, of course, itself arbitrary and artificial: many points might be brought equally well under either head, and a satisfactory judgment, even in particular problems, whether literary or historical, cannot be reached until the whole work and the particular passage in question have been surveyed from every profitable point of view: but with this large *caveat* to control his results the practical student may courageously proceed on his way.

§ 2. The work of Herodotus (the unique and authentic character of which *inter alia* is here assumed) has come down to us with a ready-made division into nine Books. These divisions hardly any one now supposes to be primitive, or made by the author himself[1]: they may be dated to the Hellenistic period, and may have been made in Alexandria.[2] But when, where and by whomsoever made, they were made with great skill and judgment; they correspond to the grand argument of the work; they are dictated or justified by the natural divisions of the story or subject matter, nature in this case being indistinguishable from art. In short, the nine-fold division of the work of Herodotus, though not formally his doing, is so obviously just and reasonable, that it might fairly be taken to suggest, to a greater or less extent, even the secret history of the composition of the work. At any rate, there was, so far as is known, no rival division made or suggested

---

[1] A. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, Leipzig, 1890, p. 13, seems to argue that the existing division into nine Books is from the hand of the author. The expression ὁ πρῶτος τῶν λόγων, 5. 36, does not support the argument, see note *ad l.* The division is, indeed, Herodotean, inasmuch as it corresponds to the best Analysis of the work, but that is another matter.

[2] This is A. Bauer's suggestion: *Entstehung des herodotischen Geschichtswerk*, Vienna, 1878, p. 5. His other suggestion, that the Egyptian *Logi* led to the subdivision of the work, is almost superfluous, if the tripartition below given be rightly grounded. Wiedemann (*l. c. supra*) may be left to explain how and why, if a 'Grammarian' could not have been guilty of the anti-grammatical division of Hdt. 7/8, a similar division originated in the other cases mentioned by him, viz. Thucydides 3/4, Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5/6, *Hellenics* 3/4, 6/7. It seems probable that the older historical prose works were not subdivided into 'Books' until later writers had begun to compose in 'Books.' As the summaries in the *Anabasis* (Bks. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 *ad init.*) are obviously spurious, it is probable that no author previous to Ephoros had written prose works in 'Books.' (See Diodor. 16. 76, βίβλους γέγραφε τριάκοντα, προοίμιον ἑκάστῃ προθείς, cp. 5. 1). Herodotus and Thucydides do not quote even the Iliad and Odyssey by reference to Books; the διόρθωσις in this case was certainly Alexandrine. Cp. Susemihl, *Gr. Lit.* i. 330 ff.

in antiquity,[1] a fact which is in itself some guarantee of the correctness of the existing divisions: nor has the ambition of modern editors aspired to improve on the received division into nine Books.

§ 3. It may, however, fairly be doubted whether the full significance of the nine-fold division, and of the reasons underlying it, have always been duly apprehended. The practice of most editors points rather to an adverse decision, and the debate on the question whether the work of Herodotus is finished and complete, from the author's point of view, could hardly have run to such lengths, or ended so indecisively, as in the case heretofore, had due stress been laid upon the considerations now to be urged. It is not enough to observe that the work of Herodotus lends itself easily and obviously to the division into nine Books, each of these Books being more or less a literary unit in itself, with a natural beginning and end. A broader, a more fundamental, primary, and significant division presents itself, when the nine Books are regrouped into three successive and sharply-contrasted sections, or volumes. The three-fold division of the one great united and complete story is in truth more obvious, indisputable and convincing than the nine-fold division, which stands in a subordinate and derivative relation to the other and simpler. Convenience of reference, for literary and historical purposes, demands indeed the division into Books of moderate dimensions, in this as in other cases; and the particular division into nine has almost everything in its favour. But among the considerations which justify the nine-fold division, it can hardly be an accident that the nine parts may have been reached by the tripartition of three original parts, and that they constitute a division of a division, suggesting a ground-plan for the whole work of extraordinary and memorable symmetry, with a mutual correspondence and balance between divisions and sub-divisions, going far to assure any reader, who has possessed himself of this clue, that the work is finished as it stands, and incapable of addition or appendix, without the destruction of its literary form and artistic finish.[2]

---

[1] The case was otherwise with the works of Thucydides and of Xenophon. Cp. Marcellinus, *vita Thucydidis* 58 τὴν πραγματείαν αὐτοῦ οἱ μὲν κατέτεμον εἰς τρεῖς καὶ δέκα ἱστορίας, ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλως. Diogenes Laertius 2. 6, συνέγραψε δὲ [sc. ὁ Ξενοφῶν] βιβλία πρὸς τὰ τετταράκοντα ἄλλων ἄλλως διαιρούντων.

[2] Even Ed. Meyer's *Ist Herodots Geschichtswerk vollendet? Rh. Mus.* 1887, p. 146 (now reprinted in his *Forschungen*, 1892, p. 189), does not take the above-given point into account.

§ 4. In order to realise the three-fold plan underlying the work of Herodotus it is convenient to compare the two extreme members of the triple unity, before considering the nature and character of the intervening elements, which serve, according to the critic's point of view, to connect or to separate them. Even the briefest and most general comparison (undertaken with adequate knowledge) would serve to show that the points of contrast between the first three Books of Herodotus and the last three Books are so great and startling as to make it difficult to comprehend the two sections as equal parts of a single literary work. True, in respect to dialect, vocabulary, style and so forth, the two sections, here hypothetically in juxtaposition, give evidence of a common authorship; but if material considerations be taken into account, the two sections might well belong to different works, even if by one and the same author. The last three Books (7, 8, 9) form by themselves an obvious unity both materially and formally. On the one hand, the seventh book is clearly marked off from the sixth: on the other hand the seventh passes into the eighth, the eighth into the ninth, without grammatical or stylistic break and without material interruption. The three Books, taken together, contain, in an almost unbroken and continuous narrative, the story of the great Invasion in the time of Xerxes. The subject is a single war, complicated indeed in virtue of its magnitude and the variety of arms and operations comprised in it, yet confined *ex hypothesi* to a couple of successive campaigns, and requiring for the action of the story neither a very extensive theatre, nor a long-drawn chronology. The scenes of the story are laid, in the main, within an area familiar to Greeks in the fifth century, and requiring little description. For the most part the geography is incidentally involved in the action of the story, and but little treated as a matter of interest in itself; while the time required for the events as narrated is reckoned by seasons, or years, or at most by a decade from the date of Marathon,[1] or of Paros,[2] to the return from Sestos.[3] If, indeed, the continuous story of the single war, which fills the main bulk of the last three Books, be taken, as it fairly may be taken, for the real back-bone of this section of the whole work, the time-condition for the connected story and subject is fully supplied by two or three years of our notation, to wit, from the mustering of the forces in the year 481[4] to the capture of Sestos in the early

[1] 7. 1. [2] 6. 135. [3] 9. 121. [4] 7. 26-36.

spring of 478 B.C. The general character of the narrative corresponds to these simpler and more easily fulfilled conditions. The narrative, which is continuous and comparatively free from digressions, is historical, that is, truthful in character, and the history is to the author recent history. Criticism has indeed shown that the traditions of the great Invasion as preserved by Herodotus have not escaped transfiguration by the mytho-poetic faculty:[1] fiction is largely blended with fact; interests, humours, fancies, pieties, a dozen various powers have contributed to the record, and the result is far from being the truth exacted by the historical standards of to-day. Still, for the actual history of the war with Xerxes, and much connected therewith, the last three Books of Herodotus remain to us a primary and invaluable authority, a golden treasury of evidences. But the case stands very differently with the histories contained and offered by the first three Books. From almost every material point of view the first volume of the work affords truly marvellous contrasts to the last volume. Mere general propositions are here indeed, as usually, misleading. To do proper justice to the matter many distinctions must be introduced. The historical value of the matter found in Herodotus' work varies not merely from volume to volume, or from Book to Book, but from paragraph to paragraph, from sentence to sentence, from line to line. Every separate story, every individual statement is to be tried on its own merits. Distinctions must be drawn between matters of fact of which Herodotus is the unconscious witness, and the information which he explicitly and professedly bequeaths to posterity: between matters of which he had, or might have had, the express evidence of his senses, or the testimony of good witnesses, and matters which were of remoter evidence or origin: between traditions derived from good Hellenic or foreign sources, and traditions in which interests of one kind or another are latent or patent. Tried by careful and discriminative methods a great deal, even in the first three Books of Herodotus, remains of almost infinite value for the modern historian—independently of the secondary value, as literature, in itself illustrative and evidential, which even the most harsh or the most careless criticism allows that part of the work. In

[1] K. W. Nitzsch's paper, *Rh. Mus.* N. F. xxvii. 226 ff. (1872), and N. Wecklein's tract, *Ueber die Tradition der Perserkriege*, Munich, 1876, were 'epoch-making' in this respect.

the marvellous second Book the extremes of value meet. There are matters of fact of almost every shade of meaning to be found in it. Evidences in regard to the mind and character, the adventures and life of the historian himself: evidences in regard to the state of knowledge and ignorance in the cultivated society of his time: evidences in regard to the physical facts in the writer's own present: traditions of widely varying value in regard to the past, from the comparatively accurate record of the last native dynasty in Egypt, to the grotesque and laughable substitutes for history connected with the memory of 'Rhamsinitos' and the Pharaohs of the three empires. What is true of the second Book is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the first and of the third Books also. Still, when due allowance is made for the special merits of each particular case, for the fictitious elements in the last three Books and the historical elements in the first three Books, a broad general difference in regard to the respective character of these two primary sections in the work as a whole cannot be denied or much diminished. In historic character and truth, in chronological conditions, in the geographical elements implied or explicitly introduced, in the subject matter and connexion or argument underlying the details, there is a sharp and a far-reaching difference between the first and the third volumes, or major sections, of the work. The first three Books do not form so much a single continuous story, as a mass of stories concerning nations and generations of men, sometimes but very indirectly related to one another. The second Book introduces, indeed, a colossal excursus, almost like a separate and substantive work, upon Egypt and the Egyptians. This Book is sometimes regarded as unduly breaking the unity and cohesion of the whole story told by Herodotus: but from the present point of view the matter contained in it, or something equivalent, is absolutely necessary in order to preserve the balance and harmony of the work in its three-fold division, and further to point completely the contrast between the first and the third volumes. An excursus or digression would be no digression, if it did not interrupt an otherwise continuous argument; and a unity, both material and literary, does undoubtedly pervade the heterogeneous elements, out of which the first three Books are composed, especially when the second Book is temporarily withdrawn; but a first perusal leaves many students too much bewildered and overcome by the masses of details to detect the unities of interest and of action. The

subject is not a single short war for freedom, issuing in the secured liberty of Hellas, but a secular struggle, or series of struggles for empire, issuing in the triumph of Persia, and the unification of the civilised world, outside Hellas proper, in the hands of the Persian king. This story, however, is so buried under the mass of digressions and excursus, larger or smaller, of one kind and another, that the reader is sometimes at a loss to decide whether the Father of History is himself conscious of the art which conducts the stately yet multifarious pageant of the nations through his pages. The scenes for this great argument are not, for the most part, laid in Greece proper, nor in Greek territory. Such episodes as are located in Sparta, or Athens, or Samos or Corinth mark digressions from the principal narrative: the interest, the point of view are, on the whole, non-Hellenic, within a civilised but a 'barbarian' world. The history is the history of Lydia, of Media, of Persia, of Egypt, above all of Persia; Sardes and Ecbatana, Babylon and Memphis, and, above all, Susa are the centres of interest; the Greek history which enters, as synchronous or ancillary to the main story, is made, so to speak, a function of the non-Hellenic history. Not but what every considerable passage, almost every detail, is thoroughly hellenised in tone, colour, ethos and sentiment; but it is not the history of Hellas that is in the main narrated: it is an Hellenic version, or number of versions, of non-Hellenic history. From the nature of the case the chronological conditions are large and indefinite; an immense retrospect, a number of vast chronological parallels are driven back into the past. The authentic history is carried a century, two centuries back before the writer's time: up to the age of Kroisos and of Peisistratos,[1] of Anaxandrides and Ariston in Sparta, up to the age of Gyges in Lydia, Deiokes in Media, Psammetichos in Egypt.[2] Behind these epochs looms a vast antiquity in Egypt, in Asia, not to say in Greece itself. It is small wonder if these partially-apprehended parallels, this dim and vast perspective, grow more dubious and questionable as they recede, and if the systematic order into which they are worked by the historian's art, is rather literary than scientific. The historical here is less historic, persons are more doubtful, actions are less politic, morality and mythology have made more free with tradition. In all these

[1] *Circa* 560 B.C., cp. 1. 6, 29, 59, 65, 67 (5. 71).

[2] *Circa* 650 B.C., cp. 1. 14, 16, 73, 96; 2. 152.

and some other respects the contrast between the first three Books and the last three Books can hardly be exaggerated. There is, indeed, one material point of community in the observation that the main theme of the first volume is the rise of Persia, and the main theme of the last volume is the failure of Persia; but the themes are handled on widely different scales, from points of view almost opposed to one another, and with results correspondingly different. This is not the place to pursue the analysis of the first and last divisions of the work of Herodotus into further detail. But, in short, viewing the six Books (1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9) as two separate groups we see that, if now they stood alone, it would be difficult to understand how they came to be members of one literary whole, so different are the chronological and geographical conditions, in the two groups respectively, so sharp the contrasts between their historic qualities and materials. In the first three Books Greek history is so to speak an accident, the non-Hellenic, the barbarian history is the essential factor in the argument: in the last three, the history is the history of the Hellenes, though the barbarians are of necessity present as the opposite of Hellas. In the first three, enormous times and large spaces are demanded for the narrative; the known world is displayed, or traversed by the actors in the story; generations, centuries, even millenniums are taken as time-units: in the three last Books, the shores of the Aegean, the lake-like Mediterranean waters, the notorious passes, bays and islands of Hellas are enough for the action of the story. In the first three, the pageant of barbaric civilisations is unfolded in the splendour and magnitude of its works of peace, its deeds of war: in the last three Books, the narrative concentrates upon the course and issue of a single war, a war great and significant, but brief and recent. In the last three Books we have a fairly historic tradition, or treasury of traditions amalgamated, 'contagminated,' or left in the raw state, but always fairly manageable and responsive to criticism: in the first three Books is contained a bewildering mass of traditions, legends, myths, memories, imaginations, theories, hypotheses, in which to separate the credible from the incredible, the serviceable from the unhistoric, the fictitious from the true, is a veritable labour of Psyche, only to be accomplished by the co-operation of a multitude of specialists, many of whom owe little or no allegiance to Hellenic studies.

§ 5. Such are the leading aspects of the patent contrast between the first and the last volumes of Herodotus; a contrast so extreme as to leave us doubtful whether the volumes could be essential parts of one literary whole. The connecting links between the two extreme members of the one great work, though not perhaps the complete clue to their incorporation in one and the same work, are supplied by the intervening group of three Books, numbered 4, 5, 6, and named, without any obvious or special appropriateness, Melpomene, Terpsichore, and Erato; with which, collectively and severally, this present edition is concerned. The characteristics and details of these three Books must, of course, be here pursued and noted throughout with all practicable minuteness. But for the immediate purpose of the present argument it will be sufficient to emphasise the salient characteristics of this triad, or group of three Books, in comparison and contrast with the preceding group, 1, 2, 3, and the succeeding group 7, 8, 9, in order to establish the relative importance of the middle group in the general scheme of the work.

§ 6. So little have students in general, or even apparently expert editors, been accustomed to regard the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus, *sub specie unitatis*, as forming a unity in themselves,[1] that it will here not be labour wasted to revive the argument for so regarding them. The argument is a double one: it rests, first, upon the break between the third and fourth Books, and between the sixth and seventh; it rests, secondly, upon the positive continuity and absence of material break between the fourth and fifth Books, and between the fifth and sixth. The three Books are thus detached from their predecessors, and distinct from the sequel, while in themselves, despite important digressions and asides, they are bound and fused into one by a clear and continuous unity of action and of narrative. This point is universally recognised in regard to the fifth and sixth Books, the story of the Ionian revolt being obviously told partly in the end of the fifth Book and partly in the beginning of the sixth. The undoubted

[1] The Tauchnitz edition, 1853, *cur.* F. Palm, presented the text of Herodotus in three volumes; and the third and fourth volumes of Rawlinson's translation contain, respectively, the two last triads of Books. Prof. Sayce segregated the first triad (1883). The second Book has frequently been treated as *sui generis*, as by Kenrick (1841), Wiedemann (1890), and A. Lang, in his edition (1888) of the English translation of B. R. (1584). A sound instinct led Kenrick to include Bk. 3. 1-67 in his volume.

pause created by the story of the end of Aristagoras, while affording a legitimate excuse for the division between Book and Book, is obviously not so great as to dissolve the continuity of the main narrative. The break between the fifth and sixth Books is, indeed, far less abrupt, structurally or argumentatively, than breaks occurring inside the fifth and sixth Books themselves respectively; as, for example, the breaks occasioned by the digressions on Athenian and Spartan affairs,[1] which override the chronological conditions of the direct narrative in a highly disturbing fashion.[2] The unity or continuity of the fifth and sixth Books is, in fact, easily and universally conceded, and even exaggerated; for the point more generally overlooked is the continuity, the solidarity, so to speak, between the fourth Book and its successor.

§ 7. At first sight, indeed, the fourth Book may seem insulated in the work of Herodotus, and endowed with a physiognomy as distinctive and peculiar as that which belongs to the second Book. The fourth Book is undoubtedly, from some points of view, marked with a character of its own: but this character is but the exaggeration or apotheosis of elements present in several of the other Books, and among them the fifth. 1. The fourth Book is the Book anthropological *par excellence*. The ethnography and ethnology of the uncivilised barbarians contained in the Scythian and Libyan *Logi*[3] would in themselves be enough to constitute Herodotus one of the fathers of anthropology, as now-a-days understood. But these passages are not the only passages of the kind in Herodotus. Not to dwell upon the ethnography furnished under the form of army-lists in Bks. 7-9,[4] there are in the first three Books a number of passages[5] similar in kind though smaller in bulk as compared with the ethnography of Scythia, and of Libya, presented in Bk. 4. But the special ethnographical text is, so to speak, incomplete in Bk. 4; its natural context and complement is to be found in Bk. 5. The fact that the ethnography of Thrace and the Thracians is begun in Bk. 4 (cc. 93-96) and continued in Bk. 5 (cc. 3-8) serves to emphasise the connexion between the two Books. 2. A similar

[1] 5. 39-48, 55-96; 6. 35-40, 51-93 *passim*.

[2] Cp. notes to 5. 89; 6. 85, 92 *et al.* and Appendices VII, VIII.

[3] Particularly cc. 46, 59-75, 102-109, 168-199.

[4] 7. 61-80, 84-86, 89-95.

[5] *e.g.* 1. 93, 94 (Lydians). 125, 131-140 (Persians). 178-187, 192-200 (Babylon and the Babylonians). 215 (the Massagetae). 2. 35-99 *et passim* (Egyptians). 3. 98-116 (the ends of the earth, their products and inhabitants), *et al.*

remark applies to a second point on which one of the main characteristics of the fourth Book depends. None of the other Books, as they stand, is so elaborately geographical as the fourth Book. Not merely are the geography of Scythia and the geography of Libya introduced more or less under cover of the narrative, or subjects proper to the Book: excuse is found for a display of the author's conception of the whole earth, inhabited and uninhabited, with its divisions natural or artificial, albeit to complete the outline, or picture, of the *area terrarum Herodoto nota*, recourse must be had to the account of the *Ends of the Earth* in Bk. 3,[1] while the details intervening can only be filled in by observation of the whole work *passim*. To such observation the fifth Book offers some notable materials direct and indirect,[2] and although it would hardly be possible to found on these correspondences a strong plea for the continuity of Bks. 4 and 5, yet it is fair to see in the passage on the parts beyond the Istros (cc. 9, 10) a designed appendix to the geography of Scythia and its neighbourhood given in Bk. 4, and to suggest some relation between the *pinax* exhibited by Aristagoras at Sparta as recorded in Bk. 5 with the maps of the earth, according to the Ionians, over which Herodotus makes merry in Bk. 4.[3]

§ 8. But it is not on the solidarity of the anthropology, ethnography, and geography in Bks. 4 and 5 that the main inner argument for the unity of the 'Books' rests, but upon the obvious or easily ascertainable continuity of the main narrative, whether viewed chronologically or viewed as a series of related actions. Apart from episodes and digressions, in which the author places himself more or less arbitrarily at various dates above and below the period proper, so to speak, to the standpoint of these three Books, the events recorded may be said to extend from the capture of Babylon about 518 B.C.,[4] or the invasion of Europe in 512 B.C.,[5] to the battle of Marathon in 490 B.C.,[6] or the failure of Miltiades at Paros in 489 B.C.,[7] and his trial, condemnation and death

[1] cc. 98-116.

[2] *e.g.* cc. 9, 16, 17, 117-122. More especially, however, 52, 53 (the road from Sardes to Susa).

[3] 5. 49; cp. 4. 36.

[4] 3. 150-158. Sayce (note *ad l.*) dates the second revolt of Babylon mentioned on the Behistun inscription 515 B.C. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte d. Alterthums*, i. 615, dates it 519 B.C. In any case the Behistun inscription as nearly as possible covers the period represented by the Persian history in Hdt. 3.

[5] For this date cp. Appendix III.

[6] Cp. Appendix X.

[7] 6. 132 ff.

subsequently. A lower or later date as a *terminus ad quem* cannot be brought into the direct narrative, for the seventh Book takes the battle of Marathon as its chronological point of departure.[1] Thus references to later events, though intrinsically valuable, and also important as factors in determining the date of composition and other problems, are not included in the present argument. The year 490 or 489 B.C. is, therefore, the chronological finale for the middle volume, so to speak, of Herodotus, just as the year 480 or 479 B.C. is the end of the third. It may with more reason be sought to push the chronological start for the narrative behind the date of the invasion of Europe, or of the capture of Babylon. Some of the excursus, or episodes, in the Books under review carry the broken chronological perspective into a dim and distant antiquity;[2] but it can hardly be contended that these passages should constitute the chronological framework of the whole, nor do they affect the argument immediately. For such passages are evenly distributed over all the three Books here grouped together, and indeed over the two other groups or triads likewise. More pertinent to the matter in hand are the passages which, though digressions from the point of view of the mere literary structure of the Book or Books in question, are essentially proper or ancillary to the general stream of the continuous narrative. Thus, although it cannot be disputed that a capture of Babylon, or an invasion of Europe by Dareios in person, be the express or structural *terminus a quo* for the period treated in these Books, yet the digressions on matters essential to the main story, and virtually contemporaneous, carry the date some years higher up. From the death of Hipparchos in 414 B.C. at least the fuller stream of narrative flows fairly continuous.[3] If the conventional date for the alliance with Plataea could be maintained, the point of departure might be pushed back to 519 B.C., but that convention is no longer maintainable.[4] That date involved a chronological overlapping between the third and the fourth (fifth and sixth) Books; nor is that overlap in any wise removed by the revision of the date of the Atheno-Plataean alliance; for the story of the accession of Kleomenes is related in Bk. 5, and carries back in any case to 519 B.C. or thereabouts, and Kleomenes is already king in

---

[1] 7. 1.

[2] *e.g.* 4. 5-13 (origin of the Scyths); 145 ff. (the Minyae); 5. 82 ff. (origin of the Aigineto-Athenian quarrel); 6. 137 (Pelasgi in Attica).

[3] 5. 55.

[4] 6. 108. See notes *ad l.*

Sparta at the coming of Maiandrios, as related in Bk. 3.[1] Thus it might be fairly argued that, while the explicit chronology of the direct narrative in these Books starts with the invasion of Europe by Dareios (variously dated from 508 B.C. up to 516 B.C.[2]), the implicit chronology of the continuous narrative is by an afterthought, or by a retrospect essentially organic in the direct narrative, carried back to 519 B.C., the three Books thus covering some thirty years. There is nothing foreign in such a device to Herodotus' methods of historiography; quite the reverse. It is strictly parallel to the method exemplified in the first Book, where the age of Kroisos and of Peisistratos is taken as the express starting-point, only to be superseded by retrospects which carry back the Lydian record to Gyges, and the Medo-Persian to Deiokes the contemporaries of Psamatik, a century before Kroisos. But a hitch, or rather a lacuna, occurs in the traditions preserved by Herodotus, between the final usurpation of Peisistratos and the murder of Hipparchos. Several decades of Athenian tradition are all but lost to Herodotus, and the years from 529 to 519 B.C., and again from 519 to 514 B.C., are sparsely represented by such fragments as those on the fortunes and misfortunes of the Philaidae (6. 34-39, 103), or the expulsion of the Alkmaionidae (5. 62). It is, indeed, the sixth Book, not the fifth or the fourth, that supplies the links between the Athenian traditions in the first Book concerning the age of Peisistratos, and the traditions in the fifth Book which concern the expulsion of the Peisistratidae. The digression in Bk. 5 on Spartan affairs seems to refer expressly back to the digression on Sparta in Bk. 1,[3] irrespective of the notes on Spartan history that occur in the intervening text.[4] But the case is different with the greater digressions on Athens and Athenian history, in Bk. 5; they are not expressly referred back to the digression in Bk. 1, and it is but an accident, to all appearance, that Bk. 6 supplies, to some extent, the missing links. Had due weight been always allowed to this observation, it would not have been the fashion to present the two digressions on Sparta and on Athens, in Bk. 1 and in Bk. 5, as respectively continuous, and forming exact parallels. The treatment of Sparta and the treatment of Athens in the two cases are not strictly co-ordinate. The Spartan traditions are

---

[1] 5. 39-48; cp. 3. 148.

[2] Cp. Appendix III.

[3] See note 5. 39.

[4] 3. 45-47, 54-56, 148; 4. 145-149.

ostensibly taken up in Bk. 5 where they had been dropped in Bk. 1; nay, they are made to overlap and cohere the more by the retrospective account of the marriages of Anaxandridas[1] and the fortunes of his sons. The Athenian traditions are not taken up in Bk. 5 where they were dropped in Bk. 1. There is a gap, partially filled in less by the story of the Alkmaionidae in Bk. 5 than by the stories of the Philaidae in Bk. 6. The imperfect observation of these peculiarities in the structure of the fifth and sixth Books may in part be accountable for the editorial practice of treating these two Books, divorced from the fourth, as something of an isolated unity in the work of Herodotus, and of dividing the whole work for practical purposes into two volumes instead of into three.

§ 9. In one respect, indeed, there is a conspicuous breach in the unity of the actions comprised in the chronological period (519-489 B.C.) determined for these Books. This breach has likewise contributed to detach the fourth Book from its immediate successors, and to disturb the natural divisions of the whole work. The Libyan *Logi* obliterate, to some extent and at first sight, the continuity of Bks. 4 and 5; not because they contain a large amount of digressional matter in the form of ancient history, or contemporary ethnography, but because they introduce an independent and separate series of events, a different action, to all appearance but loosely connected with the main stream of the story, by the feeble accident of a reputed or real synchronism. Thus, the whole of the Libyan *Logi* (which form about one-third of the fourth Book) present the appearance of a digression, and the strictly continuous action in the narrative is resumed in Bk. 5, c. 1 from Bk. 4, c. 143—the intervening text being, so to speak, ignored. Even for this structural device there is analogy in the other portions of the work. On a smaller scale the Libyan *Logi* afford in the second volume a parallel to the Egyptian excursus in the first, which fills the whole of the second Book; while, if it be remembered that in the last volume, and particularly in Bk. 9, Herodotus narrates in succession two series of actions, the operations of the Greek army and the operations of the Greek navy, which are synchronous *ex hypothesi*[2]; while in Bks. 7 and 8 he treats in similar fashion two series of actions, which were not merely synchronous, but strategically

[1] 5. 39-48. [2] 9. 90, 101.

interdependent[1]: it may be admitted that there is nothing abnormal in his method of presenting synchronous series of events in Bk. 4. The question, therefore, may here be postponed, whether there was in fact any strategic or politic relation between the expedition into Europe and the expedition into Libya, and whether Herodotus is right in his notion that the bournes of the one and of the other were virtually identical, a universal Persian empire. Nor need the question here be raised whether the story of the Libyan expedition is largely and conspicuously prejudiced and pragmatic in itself. Its pragmatic purpose, in the work of Herodotus, the literary intention with which the Libyan *Logi* are introduced in this place, is what has here been the point of the argument. They are in their nature somewhat of an episode, and a breach of continuity, whatever their historical value may be. But still, judged by the hypothesis of their introduction, and considered in the light of analogies suggested by the structure of the first volume and of the last volume, they are far from justifying the practice, or the view, which isolates the fourth Book from the fifth and sixth Books, ignores the essential continuity of the narrative throughout, and thus destroys the artistic balance and congruity of the whole work. As will appear subsequently the Libyan *Logi* have, indeed, a remarkable and special function in the lesser unity of the fourth Book taken by itself; but although the fourth Book gains here a strong characteristic, its organic relation to the fifth Book is not thereby destroyed; and though the analogy above suggested, between the second Book or Egyptian *Logi* and the Libyan *Logi* in the fourth Book, is capable of further elaboration, and may be in part a result of some community in the *origines* for Egypt and for Libya, the Libyan *Logi* are less of a breach, both in bulk and in character, in the unity and continuity of Bks. 4, 5, 6, than the second Book is in the unity of Bks. 1, 2, 3. However the matter be looked at, the perception will probably deepen and grow that the three middle Books, if not so conspicuously and transparently a whole within the whole as Bks. 7, 8, 9, are yet more of such a minor whole than the first three Books, the unity of which, from the author's point of view, can hardly be gainsaid; nor is this unity and continuity

[1] The defence of Thermopylae (7. 202-225) and the naval engagements off Artemision (8. 1-21).

invalidated either by the recognition of the distinct and individual structure of each of the three Books in question here (as likewise of the six here passed over), or by the discovery of the multitude of subordinate members, or tributaries, which go to make up each of the numerous acts, or series of acts, descriptions or narratives, which have been incorporated by the author in this volume of his text.

§ 10. To display in detail the individual structure of the fourth, fifth and sixth Books, and to emphasise the remarkably diverse and heterogeneous elements, or materials, of which this volume of the text is composed, or conglomerated, is the function of a subsequent analysis. The unity of structure which underlies and pervades the extraordinarily complex material of these Books having been provisionally indicated, it will be next in order to characterise this second volume, or section, of the whole work in comparison with the other two, already described in general terms. For this purpose the four canons or tests, previously employed, the conditions, namely, of place, time, subject, and truth may be re-applied. In other words, we are to consider the geographical and chronological framework, or antecedents of the story, or stories, involved; the national or political interests and points of view implied in the narrative, and its general character or quality as history, or true story. In regard to these canons, speaking generally, the character of the fourth, fifth and sixth Books, viewed as a whole, is ambiguous, and not so clearly defined as the characters of either of the other two groups of Books. The middle Books are in fact intermediate and transitional in character. They present a dissolving view, or a series, nay, a large amphitheatre, of dissolving views. They partake of the characteristics of each of the extreme groups, and in a manner combine them. The 'barbarian' interest in the middle Books is more extreme than in the first three Books, for the second triad deals largely with the outer and utter barbarians; yet the Hellenic interest is more special and intense than in the more exclusively Hellenic Books (7-9), for the second triad deals largely with the inner history of the Greek states, and their relations to one another, irrespective of the non-Hellenic interests. Here too, still speaking generally, the fourth Book may seem to lean towards the 'barbarian' interest in Bks. 1, 2, 3. The main story is still told, as it were, from the non-

Hellenic standpoint, and nominally, to a large extent, from non-Hellenic sources; while the sixth Book, containing, as it does, the record of Marathon, may seem to lean towards the latter Books, which pile the fuller records of Thermopylae, Salamis and Plataea upon the scantier story of the first Athenian achievement. Meanwhile, the fifth Book, the centre of this group, and of the whole work, focusses the Hellenic interest twice over: first in the anti-medism of the story of the Ionian Revolt, and, secondly, in the positive and centripetal tendency of its great passages of pure Spartan and Athenian history.

§ 11. Apart from these passages the Books may be said to carry on the story of the advance of the Persian power; its approximation to the great centres of Hellenism; its absorption of Hellenic colonies; its gains at the expense of barbarous Europe; its reconquest of rebel Ionia; its spread over the Aegean; its assault on Attica.

The geographical conditions presupposed in this theme are remarkable as compared with those presented in the preceding Books. Speaking generally, the scene is transferred from non-Hellenic to Hellenic soil, and in the fifth and sixth Books the geographical assumptions are similar to those in Bks. 7, 8, 9, especially Bks. 8, 9. The actions are laid in familiar regions, the description of which the story-teller may, for the most part, take for granted. With Bk. 4 the case stands differently; here, indeed, as above recognised, we have geography *in excelsis*, but the fact has been sufficiently discounted, and must not be allowed to destroy the hardly-won recognition of the continuity of the fourth and fifth Books, but should rather be employed to emphasise the special character of this volume, into which, apparently, the author has thrown many a thing for which he found no lodging elsewhere. The geographical overweight is, in fact, but a further evidence of the composite character, the transitional purpose, of this part of the finished work. That character is not less conspicuous when the chronological scale of the narrative is considered. In this, his middle passage, the historian is out of the dim illimitable vistas and labyrinths of Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Lydian, Median, Persian history; but the chronological scale is not yet reduced to the narrow and exact proportions which obtain in the last three Books. The continuous and advancing narrative but carries us, as above shown, over a period of thirty years at most;

the retrospects take us, however, much farther back towards the beginnings of things. Not to treat the literary introduction, on the origin of the Scyths, over seriously, the passages on the Hellenic states present early conditions of Sparta[1] and of Athens[2] to view; something more than a glimpse is given into the colonial diffusion of the Hellenes,[3] into the age of the Tyrants:[4] the ever-growing communion and union of Hellenic stocks and states are shadowed forth through the centuries.[5] Still, even in these matters it is at most with generations, or with centuries, that the narrator deals, in contrast with the millenial conditions of the historic perspectives in the first three Books, and in distinction from the brief and all but contemporary vision of events presented in the three last Books.[6]

---

[1] 4. 145-149; 6. 52 ff.

[2] 6. 137 f.

[3] On the Euxine (4. 8, 18, 76 ff., 95, 103, 108; 6. 33); Hellespont (4. 14, 85, 95, 144; 5. 1, 65, 94; 6. 34-39); the West (4. 15, 99, 152; 5. 9, 43-47, 124; 6. 17, 22-24); Libya (4. 150 ff., 179, 197; 5. 42); to say nothing of Kypros (5. 113), or of the Aegean at large.

[4] In Corinth, 5. 92; Sikyon, 5. 67; Kyrene, 4. 159 ff.; Athens, 5. 55 ff.; Ionia and Hellespont, 4. 138, etc.; 5. 37, etc.; Kypros, 5. 104, 113; Italy and Sicily, 5. 44 ff.; 6. 23 ff., etc.

[5] Cp. the celebrated text, 8. 144 τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὸν κτλ. with the illustrations afforded by this volume, *e.g.* consanguinity (ὅμαιμον) in Sparta, 4. 145-149; 5. 72; 6. 53 ff.; in Kyrene, 4. 161. Ionian *phylae* in Sikyon and Athens, 5. 66 f., etc. Language and literature (ὁμόγλωσσον), 6. 119 (τὴν ἀρχαίην γλῶσσαν), 6. 138 (γλῶσσαν τὴν Ἀττικήν); 4. 155; 6. 98; 4. 87 (γράμματα Ἑλληνικά); 5. 57 f. (γράμματα Ἰωνικά), 6. 27 (γράμματα διδάσκεσθαι); for the literature see §§ 16, 20 *infra*. Religion (θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι), in Delos, 4. 33 ff.; 6. 97; Delphi, 4. 150 ff.; 5. 92; 6. 19, 77, etc.; Olympia, 5. 71; 6. 103; 5. 22; 6. 70. Hellenic deities (θεοὶ οἱ Ἑλλήνιοι), 5. 92, 93, 49. Hero-worship, 5. 47, 115; 6. 38. Common culture and customs (ἤθεα ὁμότροπα), 4. 77, 78, 95, 108; 5. 42, 58, 67 f.; 6. 27, 43, 86, 137, etc. See, further, notes on the list of Agariste's suitors, 6. 127; the use of the term Ἑλλάς, 5. 32, 49; 6. 106, 138. The very interest in barbarian states and tribes, including the uncivilised, implies the growing consciousness of a common Hellenism. Excommunications (5. 67, 72, 88; 6. 38) are less to the point in this connexion than the growth of 'great friendships,' as between Kyrene and Thera (4. 152), Chalkis and Samos, Eretria and Miletos (5. 99), Miletos and Sybaris (6. 21), etc. In estimating such passages it is important to consider how far the highly stimulated patriotism of the Persian wars may have reacted on the records of the earlier period (cp. § 17 *infra*); but even after all due allowance has been made, there remains a substantial contrast between the tone and effect of the last three Books and the three middle Books in the work of Herodotus; the later achievement and spirit have not by any means wholly destroyed the perspective of a developing Hellenism.

[6] In 6. 98 Herodotus appears to draw a distinction between the period beginning with Dareios and the twenty generations preceding. See note *ad l.*

Concerning the historic quality, credibility, or truth, of the matters in these Books it is harder to frame any general proposition that can be of use. The truth (as distinct from the honesty) of the *Histories* of Herodotus cannot be adequately measured from volume to volume, nor even from Book to Book; every story, every sentence must be separately weighed. Still, with this *caveat* entered, and looking at the question in the broadest way, it may fairly be expected that the three middle Books will hardly be found to report the objective series of events in a manner so full, coherent, credible and authoritative as that of the last three Books; while, on the other hand, it may be expected that the historic truth will be found less involved in myth, legend, fiction and error than in Bks. 1, 2, 3. More than this admission cannot be extorted from a critical observer, nor will such an one ever relax his vigilance over any page of this author without disaster, for there is no page on which fact and fiction—if so crude a distinction may be admitted for the sake of argument—are not to be found lying side by side, or indissolubly interpenetrated, mutually affected, not as oil and vinegar, but as water and wine. And, when the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus are critically studied, they are found to contain facts solid and objective as those preserved in any other Books, or passages, of the work (or in any other work), and fictions romantic, droll, purposeful and pragmatic, as comedies of Aristophanes,[1] fables of Aesop,[2] orations of Perikles,[3] or oracles of Bakis.[4]

§ 12. The argument as given so far is sufficient to show that in truth the main narrative in the three Books here under discussion is a continuous and united whole, if less obviously, yet hardly less essentially, than the continuous narrative in Bks. 1, 2, 3 (or rather Bks. 1 and 3) on the one hand, or Bks. 7, 8, 9 on the other. This chronological unity must be conceded in regard to the simple and obvious story, which may be said briefly to comprise the invasions of Europe, the Ionian revolt, the Marathonian campaign. Considerations above urged tend to show that, even if the narrative be complicated by the introduction of digressions and retrospects

---

[1] *e.g.* 6. 125.

[2] *e.g.* 4. 132 f.

[3] *e.g.* 4. 118 f.; 5. 49; 6. 109.

[4] 4. 178; 5. 43. Notably romantic elements may be found in the story of Phronime, 4. 154; of Dorieus, 5. 42-48; of Demaratos, 6. 61, 62, 67, and others.

on Spartan and Athenian affairs, the main stream hardly recurs to a point before that marked by the opening of Bk. 4, and in so far as earlier dates are reached (in relation to the main stream of events), they are not reached at the expense of Herodotus' ordinary methods of composition, or in such a way as to take the fifth Book, or the fifth and sixth Books, out of organic relation to the fourth. If, on the one hand, the advance of the Persian power be conceived as the main subject of the continuous narrative in these Books, it is abundantly clear that the organic connexion between the fourth and fifth Books is as close and strong as that between the fifth and sixth. If, on the other hand, the parallel or synchronous evolution of affairs in the Greek states, in particular Sparta and Athens, be conceived as only second in importance from the structural point of view, it must still be conceded that no sufficient case can be made out for detaching the fifth and sixth Books from the fourth; on the contrary, to do so is to exhibit and propagate a wholly inadequate understanding of the literary structure of the work of Herodotus, and to destroy the elaborate and classical harmony of its parts. Moreover, it is observable that the main stream and structure of the narrative in the fourth Book sets towards the coming two Books, and breaks with the preceding. The story of the expedition of Dareios into Scythia is told less as an adjunct or sequel to the history of the first years of his reign in Bk. 3, than as the first stage in the great movement which culminates thrice: first, in the Scythian expedition, again in the Ionian revolt, its suppression and sequel, and again in the Marathonian campaign.[1]

After this summary of the argument in favour of the unity and detachment, within the work of Herodotus, of the fourth, fifth and sixth Books, taken together, it is next in order to present the results of analysis applied to the Books individually; such a process being essential to any critical discovery of the sources, composition and credibility of the many and various materials brought together, and more or less completely fused into an artistic whole, by the genius of this prince of old Ionian researchers,[2] greatest of the Logographers.[3] The exercise is, of course, confined

---

[1] Oversight of this important point may have led Blakesley, and others, to discard the reading αὐτοῦ Δαρείου in 4. 1. See note *ad l.*

[2] Ἰάδος ἀρχαίης ἱστορίης πρύτανιν. Epigram *apud* Steph. Byz. *sub v.* Θούριοι.

[3] Or 'Logopoeers,' Arrian, *Anab.* 3. 30. 8.

to the volume here reprinted. The Analyses, which follow, aim at representing the materials collected in these Books from several points of view. The literary structure of each Book is exhibited in such a way as to bear witness at once to the skill of the author in composing his work, and to the appreciative intelligence of the scholar, who marked the three existing divisions. Passages, which contain the record of events for the period proper to the chronological scheme of these Books (519-489 B.C.), are re-grouped, within the table for each Book, in sequences which exhibit the author's contribution to the history of those three decades. Passages, which from the point of view of that chronology are digressions and out of the scheme, are brought into juxtaposition under provisional titles. Special emphasis is laid upon the detachment of passages primarily geographical, or ethnographical, as also of passages which present legendary, mythical, or otherwise unhistorical materials. It has not been considered necessary to reprint in immediate sequence, and without regard to the division of the Books, these various groups of sub-divisions and references: any one who uses these tables of contents will be able, without much trouble, to recompose their elements or items so as to obtain from them the contexts in which the main narrative is presented, and likewise those in which digressions of various kinds are to be found. To pursue the classification of the traditions, preserved by Herodotus, into still further ramifications, without regard to evidence from other sources, whether literary or monumental, would be to foster exaggerated ideas respecting the exclusive authority of the Herodotean work. The primary purpose of these Analyses is fulfilled, if they serve to elucidate the problems of the sources and composition of this portion of the text. But one class of notices or memoranda, those concerned with events and objects later than the fall of Miltiades (489 B.C.), is of such supreme importance for the determination of those very problems, that the analytical tables of contents are to be followed by a special discussion of all that class of memoranda, as found scattered through this triad of Books. The elucidation of these notices leads naturally to a consideration of the part played by afterthought in these records of the past, and the actual historic value, or values, of the various elements displayed by analysis. Somewhere in the course of the argument the personal equation of the author, and his relation to the events he records, and the objects

he describes, must be approximately stated and discussed. The chief gain from this methodical analysis is, perhaps, realised when we perceive an infinity of values in the work of Herodotus, and a critical absurdity in any single or general proposition regarding the whole, based upon the prevalent character of this or that part, or section of a part. The curve of credibility drawn by the higher criticism of these *Histories* moves from horizon to zenith; the degree appropriate to each of the author's stories, or statements, is a distinct and individual problem.

Book 4

§ 13. The fourth Book falls clearly, like the first, second, ninth, and perhaps the seventh, into two main parts, the division being not merely involved in the difference of subject matter, but clearly and formally marked by the author himself. The first part comprises cc. 1-144, and may be denominated, for the sake of brevity, the Scythian *Logi*: the second comprises the remainder of the Book, cc. 145-205, and is apparently by Herodotus himself named the Libyan *Logi*.[1] Two or three considerations may have prohibited the erection of these two parts into separate 'Books': (1) The second part is hardly of sufficient bulk to form a separate Book, yet from the nature of the subject matter defies incorporation with the next succeeding passages, which now form the beginning of Bk. 5. (2) The second *ex hypothesi* contains a record of events synchronous with the main course of events recorded in the first part. (3) A curiously exact parallelism, more pronounced than in any other of the Herodotean Books, may have been detected underlying the literary structure of the two parts. For, without much violence, each of the two main parts falls into three sub-divisions or elements: I. An historical, or legendary, retrospect or introduction (προδιήγησις).[2] II. An excursus, or series of digressions on lands and peoples in question, in other words, a geographical and ethnographical element. III. The direct historical narratives, in the one case, of the invasion of Europe, in the other, of the invasion of Libya, *ex hypothesi* synchronous, even if independent. The following Analysis employs these observations:—

---

[1] 2. 161.

[2] Cp. προδιηγησάμενοι 4. 145.

Bk. 4. A. The Scythian *Logi*, or the story of the expedition of Dareios, and cognate matters, cc. 1-144.

- I. Introductory retrospects.
  - i. *Causa belli*, c. 1.
  - ii. Previous history of the Scyths, cc. 2-13.
    - 1. The Scyths and their slaves, cc. 2-4.
    - 2. Origin of the Scyths: various accounts.
      - α. Native legend, cc. 5-7.
      - β. Local Greek legend, cc. 8-10.
      - γ. Combined Graeco-barbarian legend, cc. 11 f.
      - δ. The version of Aristeas, c. 13.
        - (Notes on Aristeas, cc. 14-16.)
        - (Cp. Notes on Anacharsis, cc. 76 f. Skyles, cc. 78-80. Salmoxis, cc. 95 f.)
  - [iii. Story of the Amazons, and their wedding with the Scyths, or, the origin of the Sauromatae, cc. 110-117.]
- II. Geographical and ethnographical excursus.
  - i. Geography: (*a*) descriptive, (*b*) physical.
    - *a*. 1. General description of the earth, cc. 36-45.
      - 2. The Pontos and adjacent seas, cc. (46), 85, 86.
      - 3. The rivers of Scythia, cc. 47-57.
      - 4. The land of Scythia, cc. 99-101, (17-20).
    - *b*. Physical geography; notes on climate, fauna and flora, *et sim.*, cc. 28-31, 58, *et passim.*
  - ii. Ethnography (local and anthropological).
    - 1. Various tribes and nations, cc. 17-27, viz.:—
      - α. Of Scythia, cc. 17-20.
      - β. Beyond Scythia, cc. 21-27.
    - 2. The Scyths, cc. (17-20), (46), 59-75 (-82).
    - 3. Thracians, cc. (89-92), 93-96 (cp. 5. 3-8).
    - 4. Tribes bordering on Scythia, cc. 103-109, (110-117).
  - iii. Various notes, digressions, *et sim.*
    - 1. Legends of the Hyperboreans, cc. 32-35.
    - 2. Story of Anacharsis, cc. 76-77.
    - 3. Story of Skyles, cc. 78-80.
    - 4. Numbers and marvels, cc. 81, 82, *et passim.*
- III. The story of the expedition of Dareios in person against the Scyths (cc. 1, 83-98, 102, 118-144).
  - (1. *Causa belli*, c. 1.)
  - 2. The march from Susa to the Istros, cc. 83-98.
    - i. In Asia, cc. 83, 84.
    - ii. At the Bosporos, cc. 85-89.
    - iii. In Thrace, cc. 90-98.
  - 3. The Kings (of Europe) in council, c. 102.
  - 4. The Scythian campaign, cc. 118-144.
    - i. From Istros to Oaros, cc. 118-123.
    - ii. From the Oaros to the Agathyrsi, cc. 124, 125.
    - iii. The fighting in Scythia, cc. 126-134.
    - iv. The flight of Dareios, cc. 135-142, (143).

Pause or Colophon.—Two anecdotes of Megabazos, cc. 143, 144.

B. The Libyan *Logi*, or the story of the great expedition into Libya, and cognate matters, cc. 145-205.

- I. Introductory retrospect.
  - i. Story of the colonisation of Thera from Lakedaimon, cc. 145-149.
  - ii. Story of the colonisation of Kyrene from Thera, cc. 150-158.
  - iii. History of the Hellenes in Libya down to the death of Arkesilaos III., and the application of Pheretime to Aryandes, cc. 159-167.
- II. Geographical and ethnographical excursus.
  - i. The coast, and 'nomadic' tribes from Egypt to lake Tritonis, cc. 168-180.
  - ii. The Desert, Oases, and their six tribes, cc. 181-185.
  - iii. Manners and customs of the 'nomad' Libyans, cc. 186-190.
  - iv. Libya west of Tritonis, cc. 191-196.
    Notes on the zoology, ethnology, climate, etc., of Libya, cc. 191, 197-199.
- III. Story of the Persian expedition in Libya, cc. 200-205.
  - i. The siege and capture of Barke, cc. 200-202.
  - ii. The deliverance of Kyrene, cc. 203 f.
  - iii. The divine judgment on Pheretime, c. 205.

The preceding Analysis is enough to show the extreme artificiality patent in the composition of the fourth Book. This artificiality could not be disguised by divorcing the two strictly parallel structures now combined under one number. It may be taken to support the hypothesis that these parts of the work, and the whole volume or section into which they are incorporated, were designed as a connecting link between the extreme members of the larger trinity, into which the whole work of Herodotus, as above shown, naturally divides. The indications of place, and to some extent those of time, to be collected subsequently from this Book (see § 16 *infra*), tend to show that the author was in contact with western sources before this Book assumed its present form. The Analysis itself suggests a considerable number and diversity in the sources here laid under contribution. It is, indeed, on the face of things unlikely that matters so disparate as the histories and geographies here presented side by side had previously been brought into juxtaposition or intimacy. The story of the Scythian expedition is one thing; the geography and ethnography of Scythia another. The description of Libya is out of all proportion to the story of the Persian mission to recover Barke. It may be doubted whether the stories of the early colonial adventurers, and the early history of the Greeks in Libya, stood in any connexion with the story of the Persian mission,

until Herodotus put those as a preface to this. It is possible that the expedition against the Scyths and the expedition into Libya may have been mentioned together in a Greek source before Herodotus; it is probable that the geography of Scythia and the geography of Libya had been described in more than one work previously. But the literary scheme and rationale of the Scythian and Libyan *Logi*, together with an infinity of details, are almost certainly due to the idiosyncrasy of Herodotus. For the further evaluation of the contents of this extraordinary Book the reader is referred to the concluding sections of this Introduction, to the notes on the text, and to the appendices, in which the problems immediately connected with it are discussed.

Book 5

§ 14. The main lines of literary structure in the fifth Book are less clear than those in the fourth, and are certainly not laid down on the same highly-artificial plan. From one point of view the Book is divided between a narrative of events which carries on the general course of the Herodotean argument from the point reached in the fourth Book, and a narrative, or set of narratives, recounting the history of the leading Greek states, speaking roughly, in the period covered by the Persian history in the third and fourth Books, and a part of the fifth. If these two elements in the fifth Book be separately envisaged, the matter may be distributed as follows, neglecting for the immediate purpose some other major and minor digressions:—

A. The connected chronological narrative of the continued advance of the arms and power of Persia, until checked by the Ionian revolt, together with an account of the origin and early course of this reactionary movement (cc. 1-38, 49-51, 97-126).

B. A dual excursus, inserted into the main structure of the narrative, and breaking it up, as just above shown, into three stages: the first digression (cc. 39-48) dealing with Sparta, or rather with two Spartan stories (*a.* the story of the accession of Kleomenes, cc. 39-41; *b.* the story of the adventures of Dorieus, cc. 42-48); the second digression (cc. 55-96) on a much larger and more complex scale, dealing with Athens, or rather, stringing together a number of stories, the main current of which is an important contribution to the history of Sparta, during the period,

broken in turn by a number of digressions within the digression, which demand further analysis. Provisionally, however, and in the first instance the structure of the Book may be exhibited as falling into five divisions, or stages :—

I. The advance of the Persians continued, and the immediate cause or occasion of the Ionian revolt, cc. 1-38.
II. Digression on Spartan affairs, cc. 39-48.
III. Aristagoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51 (-54).
IV. Digression on Athenian affairs, cc. 55-96.
V. The alliance of Athens with the Ionians, and the conduct of the revolt, down to the flight of Aristagoras, cc. 97-126.

From this tabulated statement it is obvious that the three parts or divisions of the Book numbered I., III., V. make up a record of events *ex hypothesi* in time successive, in causation more or less closely connected: while parts II. and IV. contain respectively two records of two series of events (neglecting digressions), more or less strictly synchronous with each other, and with the main course of the continuous narrative in the preceding Books.[1] But this five-fold sub-division of the fifth Book is so far from exhibiting adequately the extreme complexity of its structure that it may well be supplemented from a second point of view. There follows, accordingly, an Analysis in which the two main elements in the Book are treated severally, and each sub-divided into the smaller parts or sections which seem naturally to suggest themselves, without any attempt to carry the process of analysis to a point where the wood might become invisible, by reason of the trees.

A. The connected or continuous narrative.

α. The continued advance of the Persian empire.

i. The reduction of Thrace, cc. 1, 2, 12-15.
ii. The surrender of Macedon: or, the story of the young men in women's apparel, cc. 17-21.
iii. The incorporation of the Propontine states and islands in N. Aegean, cc. 26, 27.

β. The Ionian revolt.

i. The immediate cause and antecedents.

1. The affair of Naxos, cc. 28-38.
2. Aristagoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51.

[1] With this arrangement may be compared the structure of Bk. 3, as we have it, which consists of five parts, three of continuous narrative (cc. 1-38, 61-97, 118-160), and two great excursus (39-60, 98-117), dividing the narrative.

3. Aristagoras in Athens, c. 97.
4. The return of the Paionians, c. 98.

ii. Outbreak and conduct of the Ionian revolt down to the flight of Aristagoras, cc. 99-123.

iii. The defection and end of Aristagoras, cc. 124-126.

---

iv. The intrigues and end of Histiaios, and suppression of the Ionic revolt, 6. 1-32.

It will be observed that the three sections into which the first main division of the continuous narrative is sub-divided are not continuous in the text. They are in fact separated by a number of small digressions, or notes; and in the first of these sub-divisions, dealing with Thrace, the historical narrative is further interrupted in such a way as may be most easily exhibited in the following table:—

A. *a*. Continued advance of the Persian empire.
  i. The reduction of Thrace, cc. 1-27.
    a^1. The Perinthians, and others, cc. 1, 2.
      (πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ πᾶν ἔθνος τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων, c. 2.)
      b^1. Ethnographical excursus, cc. 3-10.
        1. Thrace and the Thracians, cc. 3-8.
        2. Country beyond Istros, cc. 9-10.
    a^2. The sea-coast (N. of Aegean), c. 10.
      (τὰ παραθαλάσσια, c. 10 *ad f.*)
      b^2. Digression on Dareios at Sardes, cc. 11-13.
        1. The tyrants' rewards, c. 11.
        2. Story of the Paionian *belle*, cc. 12, 13.
        [3. The mission of the spies, 3. 135-138.][1]
    a^3. Paioni, cc. 14, 15.
      b^3. Digression on the Lake-dwellings, c. 16.
  ii. The surrender of Macedon, and the story of the young men in women's apparel, cc. 17-21.
    Excursus, or notes, on
      1. The Hellenic descent of the kings of Macedon, c. 22.
      2. Dareios at Sardes, cc. 23-25 (anecdotes of Megabazos, c. 23, Otanes, c. 25).
  iii. Incorporation of the Propontine states, etc., by Otanes, son of Pharaspes, cc. 26-27.

Passing on to the second division of the continuous narrative (*β*. the Ionian revolt), a pause, or fresh start, is obviously marked

[1] The story of Demokedes, 3. 129-138, may, as Duncker (*Hist. of Antiquity*, E. T. vol. vi. p. 270 *n.*) suggests, belong chronologically to this place, and might have come in here, or below, cc. 23-25. It might, however, *pace* Duncker, be placed at Dareios' first coming to Sardes: the king gets him rather too easily from Susa to the Bosporos, 4. 85.

by the author himself at the opening of c. 28, μετὰ δὲ κτλ. The short aside on the previous history of Miletos (c. 29), which immediately follows, is treated in the Analyses above as a *quantité négligeable;* but it might be marked as a digression, and the main narrative resumed in c. 30. The story of Naxos and the immediate results of the failure there is told continuously (cc. 30-38), and the next two stages in the continuous narrative (Aristagoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51; Aristagoras in Athens, c. 97) are separated as clearly as possible from what precedes, and from each other, by the two notable digressions on Sparta (cc. 39-48), and on Athens (cc. 55-96), to be further considered below. At first sight the division and titulature of the remainder of the Book, and of the continuous story of the Ionian revolt, from the appearance of Aristagoras in Athens down to his defection and death, might be left unbroken; but the subdivisions, above given, seem so strongly marked in the literary structure of the Book, that, quite apart from their practical convenience, they can hardly be ignored. What is here exhibited is, indeed, not more but less than may be deemed essential. A fuller analysis is desirable from two points of view. It is as necessary to a discussion of the actual course of events, as to a discovery of the sources. But these two points being considered elsewhere, the broad titles of the above Analysis may be taken as sufficiently displaying the bare literary anatomy of the direct narrative in this Book. The two considerable digressions (B. and II., IV. pp. xxxiii f. *supra*) on Spartan and on Athenian history, require, however, further analysis in this place. Of the two the first, on Sparta (cc. 39-48), is much the simpler, and is in fact in itself an utterly inadequate sketch of Spartan history during the period *ex hypothesi* under review. In consequence it fails to supply any sufficient reason for the policy of Sparta in the crisis here actually reached by the main narrative. In this respect the excursus compares unfavourably with the greater excursus on Spartan affairs, more than a generation earlier, in Bk. 1. 65 ff. The passage here under review substitutes for the history of the state biographical anecdotes of its kings. This substitution may be in part an homage to the personality of Kleomenes, the greatest figure in Spartan tradition since the era of Lykurgos; but it may also in part be due to the discreet silence in which the Spartans wrapt their political and military actions, at least when

those actions were little to their credit. It is fortunate, and in many ways significant, that the shortcomings of this brief sketch of Spartan affairs are, to some extent, made good by Herodotus himself in the context. Some knowledge of Spartan action and policy during the last two decades of the sixth century, previous to the application of Aristagoras in 499 B.C., may be recovered from the second and larger excursus, ostensibly on Athenian affairs, supplemented by other digressional passages in these Books, such as the story of the Argive war,[1] of the Plataean alliance,[2] not to speak of the earlier application of Maiandrios recorded elsewhere.[3] But all these references are beside the question here immediately considered, viz. the literary anatomy of the fifth Book. From this point of view the express digression on Spartan affairs resolves itself simply into two sections :—

II. Digression on Spartan affairs, cc. 39-48.
- i. The story of the succession of Kleomenes, cc. 39-41.
- ii. The story of the adventures of Dorieus, cc. 42-48.

The material or historical aspects of these stories are more fully discussed in the notes and appendices, and need not here be anticipated.

Separated from the anecdotal or biographical traditions, which do duty for Spartan history in this Book, first by a section of the continuous narrative (III. Aristagoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51), and secondly by a geographical appendix (on the king's highway from Sardes to Susa, cc. 52-54), comes the larger and more considerable excursus on Athenian affairs (cc. 55-96), which is in itself compacted of various elements, direct narrative and digression, covers or illustrates a great variety of subjects, and calls for minute analysis. The direct narrative in this passage consists of a sketch of Athenian history from the year 515/14 B.C. to the year 500/499 B.C., or thereabouts ; in other words, from the date of the arrival of Dareios at Sardes, for the 'Scythian' expedition (4. 1), to the date of the arrival of Aristagoras at Athens (5. 97). But this sketch is complicated by a number of minor digressions, or inserted notes, to an extent which almost defies clear analysis. Nevertheless, in the following tables the attempt is made to exhibit the structure of this portion of the

[1] 6. 76-84. [2] 6. 108. [3] 3. 148.

Book, without prejudice to the problem, how such an admirable disorder may have originated.

IV. Digression on Athenian affairs, cc. 55-96.
- i. Main story, or series of stories (515-499 B.C.).
  1. The dream and death of Hipparchos (514 B.C.), cc. 55-56.
  2. The expulsion of Hippias (511/510 B.C.), cc. 62-65.
  3. History of the Athenians from the date of their liberation to the coming of Aristagoras (neglecting digressions), 510-499 B.C., cc. 66-96.

The first and second sections of this main narrative are plainly separated by the digressions on the Gephyreans, and Phoenicians in Boeotia, cc. 57-61. The second and third sections are plainly differentiated by the pause, or title, introduced by the author in the words οὕτω μὲν κτλ. c. 65 *ad fin.* So far the analysis is plain sailing. But the third section of the main narrative is traversed and shattered by a variety of sub-sections digressions, asides and what not, constituting an almost desperate chaos of pieces, the pattern of which is well-nigh inextricably confused. At one point, indeed (c. 92), an oracle is needed to decide whether the passage with which we have to deal is an article in the main narrative, or a digression in the form of such an article; while at other points (c. 9; cc. 89, 90; cc. 94, 95) main narrative and digression alternate with bewildering rapidity. We have a very Proteus in hand, but it is necessary to retain a firm hold of this body of dissolving episodes, if the secrets of its composition and origin, credibility and authority, are even to be adequately stated and discussed. With that prospect in view the following table may be submitted, as a fairly sufficient Analysis of the literary structure of the passage here immediately in question.

3. History of the Athenians from 510-499 B.C., cc. 66-96.
   a. Main story. *b.* Digressions.
   - (1) *a.* The constitution of Kleisthenes, c. 66.
     - *b.* Digression on Kleisthenes of Sikyon, cc. 67, 68.
   - (2) *a.* Attempts of Sparta and other states, including Aigina, to overthrow Athens, cc. 69-81.
     - *b.* Digression: origin of feud between Athens and Aigina, cc. 82-88.
   - (3) *a.* Project for restoring Hippias, and its failure. His retirement to Sigeion, cc. 89-94.
     - *b.* Digression: how Sigeion came into the possession of Hippias, cc. 94 f.
   - (4) The medism of Hippias, and the quarrel between Athens and the Persians, c. 96.

Even this Analysis of the passage, elaborate as it may appear, insufficiently exhibits the full complexity of the construction. Two sub-divisions in particular require further elucidation, those numbered (2) *a* and (3) *a* respectively. Further Analyses are therefore here subjoined.

(2) *a.* Attempts of Sparta, etc., to overthrow Athens, cc. 69-81.
- i. Appeal to Sparta against the democracy; expulsion of the 'accursed' legislator, cc. 69, 70.
  - *Note.*—Origin of the curse: the Kylonian ἄγος, c. 71.
- ii. The interference of Kleomenes, and his discomfiture: appeal of Athens to Persia, cc. 72, 73.
- iii. The great invasion of Attica by Kleomenes and its collapse, cc. 74-76.
  - *Note.*—On the Dorian invasions of Attica, c. 76.
- iv. Victory of the Athenians over Boeotians and Chalkis. The anathema and epigram, c. 77.
  - *Note.*—On the excellence of democracy, c. 78.
- v. Alliance of Thebes and Aigina against Athens, and hostilities, cc. 79-81.
  - [*Excursus.* (2) *b* supra, with
    - *Notes* 1. On the adoption of Ionic dress in Attica,
    - 2. On certain customs in Argos and Aigina, c. 88.]

(3) *a.* Projected restoration of Hippias, etc., cc. 89-94.
- i. Reprisals of Athens on Aigina, c. 89.
- ii. Alarm of Sparta, c. 90.
- iii. Congress of allies at Sparta, cc. 91-93.
  - *a.* Project of restoring Hippias, c. 91.
  - *b.* Opposition of Corinth, based upon memories of the Tyrants of Corinth, c. 92.
    - *α.* Story of Kypselos and his salvation.
    - *β.* Stories of Periandros.
      - 1. The advice of Thrasybulos.
      - 2. The ghost of Melissa.
  - *c.* Failure of the project, c. 93.

In regard to the somewhat confused elements which make up the whole section denominated here 3 (*a*) it is elsewhere argued that cc. 81-89 probably involve some anachronism,[1] and it is obvious that the speech put into the mouth of Sokles (c. 92), which is a colossal *ignoratio elenchi* and in itself also obviously inconsequent, from a more general point of view must be regarded as a valuable contribution to the conventional legend of the *Tyrannis*, current in the author's day. On the legitimate inferences to be drawn from the passage, and the context, as to the sources, and the date of composition, or collection of materials,

---

[1] Cp. note *ad l.*, and Appendix VIII.

by the historian, it would here be premature to enlarge. But it is difficult for an attentive reader to apply the method of pure literary analysis to the text of Herodotus, in this important excursus, without detecting the presence of many valuable clues and suggestions for the statement of those problems respecting sources and composition, upon the solution of which the historical authority of the work, line by line, in the plain sense of the terms, must largely depend.

Book 6

§ 15. The literary structure of the sixth Book is almost indescribably complicated. At times the narrative might seem to have little more unity than a batch of anecdotes, the memorial stream of events to break into a shower of spray. The unity of Herodotus' work, as a whole, the inner unity of the second of the three greater sections, or volumes, into which it may best be divided, seem to be here in jeopardy. For something more than a moment or two the unities of action and of interest are all but lost in a maze of cross purposes, a mass of details, a confusion of memoranda. For this result the nature of the historian's subject in the stage here reached is in part responsible. The sixth Book brings him and us, as it were, in due course face to face with the Hellenic aggregate, whose turn to do and suffer at the hands of the Persians is come. In the progress of ecumenical history the moment arrives for the Persian to assault the liberties of Hellas, and this Book records the results of the first encounter. But, in attacking the Greeks, Dareios was not opposing a single and united system, political and military: he was invading a nebulous infinity of autonomous states. This fact, once a source of strength and of weakness to the Greeks, in war and in peace, must ever be a source of difficulty and confusion to historians of Greece. That the Greeks formed not a single sovran state, but a host of independent political communities, made it very difficult for Dareios to conquer them, and for us, as for Herodotus, to relate their fortunes, and misfortunes, in a coherent story. So long as the course of pre-Hellenic antiquity could be depicted as a succession of great monarchies or empires, the last of which, the Persian, gave unity to the civilised Asiatic world, and looked at one time almost capable

of comprehending the whole Mediterranean basin in one political scheme, the unity and continuity of the story could be substantially preserved.[1] But at the point where, from the nature of the case (or from the nature of the evidences), the system of ancient civilisation resolves itself into a number of co-ordinate states, the unity of action and interest, necessary for successful literary treatment, disappears, until the empire of the Romans for a while restores it. It can of course be replaced in the meanwhile, to a greater or less extent, by various devices, more or less corresponding to the reality of things. For the actual history of the Greek states may be substituted an abstract scheme of typical forms or stages of social and political development, more or less true of each state generally: but that is not history. Or a unity may be imparted to the treatment of Greek history by elevating one or other Greek state into leading or representative prominence, and making a history of the many a function of the history of that one. There is much, doubtless, in the condition of the literary sources which has encouraged these devices; but scientific history protests against them, as inadequate and misleading in view of the objective order of events, and even in presence of the accumulating evidences, of one kind and another. Or, again, a transcendental unity is communicable to Greek history, when it becomes, for a time, the record of a struggle between a league of Greek states, relatively a Pan-hellenic union, and a single non-Hellenic power. But every such union was partial and brief: partial, for the forces of Hellenism were divided, scattered, preoccupied, and opposed;[2] brief, two or three years, three or four battles exhausting the genuine unity of the action.[3] In short, the treatment of Greek history must alternate between a bundle of monographs and a philosophic abstraction; for "only the state has a history," and Hellas was never a state. The genius of Herodotus seized the opportunity afforded by the traditions of the great Armada[4] for the historical treatment of an ecumenical episode, which exhibited the highest instance of Pan-hellenism

[1] This view, however, of oriental history is dissolving in the light of fuller knowledge. Cp. Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alterthums*, i. § 516.

[2] Even the defence of Hellas did not unite Hellas. See especially Hdt. 7. 145-174.

[3] Thuc. 1. 23: *τῶν δὲ πρότερον ἔργων μέγιστον ἐπράχθη τὸ Μηδικόν, καὶ τοῦτο ὅμως δυοῖν ναυμαχίαιν καὶ πεζομαχίαιν ταχεῖαν τὴν κρίσιν ἔσχε.*

[4] Cp. *τῷ μεγάλῳ στόλῳ*, Thuc. 1. 18, 2.

on record, and lent itself to literary treatment in the common interest, almost as though it had been the achievement of a single state. To have complicated the story of the last invasion by any adequate review of the antecedents and acts of the Greek states severally, might have ruined all unity in the work. His art or a happy accident saved Herodotus from any such blunder. Still less could such a review have found adequate expression in the first volume of his work without destroying the unity proper to the history of the barbarian civilisations, which is certainly the predominant interest of those Books. But in the course of the intervening Books, and particularly in the course of Bk. 6, opportunities arise, nay, a necessity is laid on the historian, of sketching the antecedents and characteristics of the several Greek states opposed to the Persian and attacked by him. The multiplication of these opportunities, the growth of this necessity, till a sort of climax is reached in the sixth Book, are not hard to explain, on objective grounds, connected with the general scheme of the work, and with the natural or primary sources of the narrative. As the Persian power becomes more and more deeply implicated with Hellas, the Greeks not forming a single state or power, but a number of states and powers, many more or less independent lines of action have to be brought together and focussed, so to speak, on the Greek side, in order that the action may be coherent and memorable. Moreover, this complexity is increased by the relations of the Greek states to each other at the time, or in the immediate past; as well as by the necessity, or at least the opportunity, of introducing matter to illustrate the special character or antecedents of particular city-states. Thus, although as above indicated, a substantial and a chronological continuity underlies the three Books (4, 5, 6), the general stream of Persian history being carried onwards systematically from the invasion of Europe to the battle of Marathon, yet there is an immense increase in the amount of Hellenic matter, in the materials for Greek history, supplied by Herodotus in these three Books, and a strongly-marked change in the tone and character of his narrative and the standpoint from which the tale is told. These characteristics reach their highest intensity in the sixth Book, and render the analysis of this Book specially difficult. The main narrative does, indeed, continue after a fashion, but it

is compounded of very disparate elements; it loses almost every pretence or appearance of sustained or intrinsic authority, and becomes now a mere string of unrelated adventures, now a bald chronicle of annalistic jottings; it is buried for a time and encompassed by masses of purely episodic matter, which have little or nothing to say to the Persian and his doings; it emerges at last into fuller view, in the story of the Marathonian campaign, only to disappear again, as if down a *katavothra*, under a final pile of Athenian anecdotes and self-interested memories. In short, the digressional element in this Book is more conspicuous than the element of direct narrative, and stands in a variety of relations thereto. There are digressions involved in the direct narrative, or at least fairly introduced as explanatory of the relations of the Greek states to Persia.[1] There are digressions, the object of which is to explain the relations of Greek states to each other.[2] There are digressions in which the internal affairs of Greek states are treated on their own merits;[3] and there are purely anecdotal items, or at least stories, for the introduction of which it is hard to find any excuse, except the all-sufficient one that they are far too good to be omitted.[4] This classification may not be exhaustive, and its members are certainly not rigidly exclusive. The first two classes of excursus are obviously and generally more closely related to the main narrative than the two last classes, but it is not always easy to draw hard and fast lines between them, or to say into which class a particular passage should be inserted; nor is it always easy to draw the line between the main narrative and the excursus in this Book.[5] The general effect is to make the literary or structural analysis extremely difficult, and a satisfactory or convincing scheme hardly attainable. It is, however, reasonable to maintain the distinction between the continuous narrative and digressional or excursional matter, as far as possible; although it may have to be admitted that even the consequent or advancing narrative

[1] Perhaps the digression on the Athenian occupation of the Chersonese, cc. 34-39, or the passages on the medism of Aigina and the Spartan interference, cc. 48-50, 61, 73, may be regarded as specially connected with the continuous theme, the advance of Persia.

[2] *e.g.* 6. 108 (Athens and Plataea).

[3] *e.g.* cc. 56-60, on the privileges of the kings of Sparta.

[4] *e.g.* c. 86, story of Glaukos; c. 125, Alkmaion's wealth.

[5] *e.g.* the story of Paros (cc. 132-135), on which see further, pp. xliv., l. f.

is made up of very disparate elements, while the excursus are heterogeneous in the extreme.

A. The direct, or continuous narrative in Bk. 6, even if not quite so conspicuously tripartite as in Bk. 5, still falls without much straining into three sub-divisions. The first concludes the story or stories of the Ionian revolt (cc. 1-32); the last contains the story or stories of the Marathonian campaign, or expedition of Datis (cc. 94-120). The structure of each of these two passages is, however, very imperfectly displayed by the bald references just given, and it is desirable to pursue the analysis farther. The process is not, however, plain sailing. In the case of the sixth Book more than in the case of any other single Book in the work of Herodotus, the major sub-divisions, and still more the minor, may have to be drawn with some appearance of free-will, and the results will lie open to contentious alternatives. For example, the first sub-division above given (cc. 1-32, end of the Ionian revolt) is obviously exposed to more than one objection. It may be urged that it includes matter (the adventures of the exiled Dionysios in the west, c. 17; adventures of exiled Samians in the west, cc. 21-25), which hardly belong to the history of the Ionian revolt, and certainly suggest a difference in origin or source. Again, it may be urged that the break or point of sub-division is not correctly placed at the end of c. 32. Chronologically, it might be argued, c. 31 begins a new narrative, and this apparent chronological break coincides likewise with the literary structure of the work, the fate of Histiaios (cc. 26-30) serving as a finale to the story of the revolt, even as the fate of Aristagoras has properly served as a finale to Bk. 5. In regard to the last section of the connected narrative in the Book a similar objection may be taken. It must, indeed, be conceded that the story of the Marathonian campaign flows on in almost unbroken continuity from c. 94 to c. 120, inclusive, the only digression (on the origin of the Plataean alliance, c. 108) being at once short and pointed. But a difficulty arises in regard to the sequel. The story of the Parian expedition (cc. 132-136) may be regarded as carrying the connected and chronologically continuous narrative one stage farther on; if so regarded, it spoils the symmetry of the tripartition above. To deal with these objections in reverse order: the story of the Parian expedition appears in the text of Herodotus not as a section of the general story, but

rather as an excursus or a sequel to the story of Marathon. It is not so much the story of an expedition to Paros as the story of the divinely ordained fate of Miltiades. Its object is less historical than ethical. Herodotus himself shows little or no sense of its political or military significance. In short, structurally the story is not a contribution to the chronological and continually advancing narrative which runs through these Books, but one of a number of heterogeneous appendices, tacked on to the story of Marathon, forming a rather complicated finale to the sixth Book, and emphasising all the more effectively the pause or breach between the second and third volumes of the work. These observations justify us in maintaining the tripartition of the continuous narrative in the sixth Book, which is accordingly here subsequently observed in the tables.

Bk. 6. Continuation of the main narrative.

A. I. The intrigues and end of Histiaios and the suppression of the Ionic revolt, cc. 1-32.

- i. The intrigues of Histiaios in Ionia, cc. 1-5.
- ii. The battle of Lade, cc. 6-16, a note on Dionysios, c. 17.
- iii. The capture of Miletos, cc. 18-21, including a note on the Sybarites and on the Μιλήτου ἅλωσις, c. 21.
- iv. The fortunes of the exiled Samians, cc. 22-25.
- v. The last adventures of Histiaios, cc. 26-30, with a note on Divine Providence, c. 27.
- vi. The recovery of Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos, and the punishment of the rebels, cc. 31, 32, with a note on the σαγήνη, c. 31.

In regard to the first section of the Book (cc. 1-32) it must be admitted that cc. 17, 22-25, relate matters not immediately proper to the story of the Ionian revolt, whether from a chronological or from a constructive point of view. But on the other hand the matters are so short and slight in themselves, and so directly related to the story, that it is hardly worth while to mark them by distinct numbers in the table, even if so doing we might emphasise their probably foreign origin. The first question here must be as to the conception of the author himself; he plainly regards these passages as parts of the narrative in place, or at the worst as mere parentheses. So much may, indeed, be admitted, even while we refuse to shatter the continuity of the text or story in this section: that these manifest asides, or parentheses, serve to betray the composite character of the narrative of the Ionian revolt as a whole, and help to explain the chronological inconse-

quence, or incompleteness, which is elsewhere the subject of special examination in this volume.[1] The last remark has some bearing upon the chief objection to the limits assigned in the literary analysis of this Book to the first part, and the break between Parts I. and II. For where exactly does the story of the Ionic revolt end, and the next part begin? It must be admitted that chronologically the point fixed by c. 32 is unfortunate in two directions. On the one hand, as elsewhere demonstrated, a later point of time is reached in cc. 28-30 than in c. 32. On the other hand, c. 31 opens with a clearly marked *principium divisionis* in the indication of a date, and this principle is so well maintained in the sequel that it forces itself into our literary analysis of the Book as the constitutive principle for the composition or recognition of the second part of the direct narrative; how, then, can the break between the first and second parts be placed in c. 32 and not in c. 30? Simply because it seems impossible to overlook the structural significance of the sentence which concludes c. 32 and sums up the three conquests of Ionia. It may further be observed that a new point of departure is gained in c. 33 by the change of scene from Ionia to the Hellespont. At the same time the inconsequence or anomaly in the analysis of the Book here admitted is not without its further value. What is clear in the main narrative of the Book is the story of the Ionic revolt and the story of the Marathonian campaign. What is not so clear is the matter intervening between the two. That matter is partly, indeed, conspicuous digression; but in part it belongs to the continuous or advancing chronicle. So much of it as belongs to the continuous chronicle forms the direct connecting link between the story of the Ionian revolt and the story of Marathon. This link is, however, itself anything but simple or easily determined. Its delimitation must, however, be attempted before the further contents of the connected narrative in this Book can be profitably exhibited in a tabulated form.

The chief characteristic of the portion or portions of the sixth Book, which serve to connect the story of the Ionian revolt with the story of the Marathonian campaign, is that they are presented in strict annalistic form, and with a chronological severity,

---

[1] See Appendix V.

wholly remote from the method of the antecedent Books, and not fully recovered[1] even in the story of the great invasion, as told in Bks. 7, 8, 9. We seem, in this passage, to have passed from the historical methods of Herodotus to the historical methods of Thucydides. The events are assigned strictly to their proper years. The years are apparently campaigning or war years; and even the distinctions of season are not wholly wanting.[2] On this wise the annals of three years which separate the suppression of the Ionian revolt from the expedition of Datis and Artaphrenes are systematically given in this Book. In the case of the first two years the method is clear. The annals of the first year (493-2 B.C.) are indeed broken or interrupted by a digression (cc. 34-40, on the Athenian acquisition of the Thracian Chersonese), but the digression is so obvious as not to obscure the chronological sequence, and the acts of the year are given in cc. 31-33, 41, 42. The annals of the second year (492-1 B.C.) are continuously and concisely given in cc. 43-45. The annals of the third year (491-0 B.C.) are in various ways more problematic. Down to a certain point, indeed, they proceed with consistency (cc. 46-51). But then and there the narrative becomes involved and confused with digressional matter, and matter anachronistic, to an almost desperate extent. An attempt to re-establish the true sequence of events is made elsewhere[3]; here it is sufficient to remark that Herodotus places in a confused and tentative fashion previous to Marathon—as is shown clearly by the transition from c. 93 to c. 94—a good many events which must have occurred after that epoch. With these provisions and observations the following table may be taken as fairly representing the Analysis of the second part of the connected narrative in the sixth Book.

Bk. 6. Continuous narrative.
- A. II. Matter connecting the history concluded in c. 32, with the history resumed in c. 94.
  - 1. Annals of the year 493-2 B.C., cc. 31-42.
    - i. Complete reduction of Ionia, cc. 31, 32.
    - ii. Recovery of the Hellespont, c. 33.
    - iii. Escape of Miltiades; capture of Metiochos, c. 41.
    - iv. The ordinances of Artaphrenes, c. 42.

[1] This observation is made on the Books as they stand, without prejudice to the order of their composition originally.

[2] χειμερίσας c. 31; τῷ ἔαρι c. 43.

[3] See Appendix VI.

2. Annals of the year 492-1 B.C., cc. 43-45.
   The work of Mardonios.
   - i. Democracies in Ionia, c. 43.
   - ii. Naval and military operations in Europe, cc. 44, 45.

3. Annals of the year 491-0 B.C., cc. 46-51 + x (or cc. 46-93, minus digressions).
   - i. Reduction of Thasos, cc. 46, 47.
   - ii. Mission of the Heralds, cc. 48, 49.
   - iii. Medism of Aigina, cc. 50-51.
     Appeal of Athens to Sparta, cc. 51, 61, 65 f.
     Intervention of Sparta, cc. 73, (85-86).
   - (iv. Subsequent hostilities between Athens and Aigina, cc. 87-93.)

(Annals of the year 490 B.C. Expedition of Datis and Artaphrenes, c. 94 ff.)

Here may conveniently follow at once the Analysis of

A. III. The expedition of Datis; stories of Marathon; or chronicles of 490 B.C., cc. 94-120, (-124).

In this passage the narrative as a whole is continuous, and the sub-divisions, which naturally suggest themselves, turn rather on the objective course of events, and upon changes of scene in the action, than upon the character or structure of the narrative itself. From both points of view the record of the actual battle of Marathon (cc. 110-116) stands up as the most important and substantial block of the story or commentary: before and after it the passages are apparently more composite, the structure most disputable. Small digressions occur at three points: (1) a note on the Delian earthquake, c. 98; (2) a longer note, on the antecedents of Miltiades and his *Strategia*, cc. 103, 104; (3) a very important note on the origin of the Atheno-Plataean alliance, c. 108. If these digressions in the narrative proper were to be taken as determining its structure, the following analysis might serve as sufficient:

- i. (cc. 94-98, Αἰολέας). Story of the expedition down to the visit to Delos. Note on the unique earthquake, c. 98.
- ii. (cc. 99-103, ἦν Μιλτιάδης). Story of the expedition down to the meeting at Marathon.
  Note on the antecedents, etc., of Miltiades, cc. 103, 104.
- iii. (cc. 105-108, πανδημεί). Preparations for battle. Note on the Plataean alliance, c. 108.
- iv. (cc. 109, 110-116). Decision. The battle.
- v. (cc. 117-124). Sundry notes and *addenda*.

The above table is, however, far from exhibiting the variety of

the matters included in the passage as a whole, and it may be doubted whether in this case the short digressions or notes should be taken as the fixed points even for the literary analysis. It seems well to supplement an imperfect and disputable Analysis by a fuller one, based upon sub-divisions, into which the story naturally falls, when account is taken of the course of action and events as here recorded.

Bk. 6. Direct narrative continued.
- A. III. The Marathonian campaign, cc. 94-124.
  - i. The commission of Datis and Artaphrenes, c. 94.
  - ii. From Kilikia to Samos, c. 95.
  - iii. From Samos to Naxos, cc. 95, 96.
  - iv. Delos; with a note on the earthquake, cc. 97, 98.
  - v. From Delos to Karystos. Persian conquest of the Kyklades, c. 99.
  - vi. Siege and capture of Eretria, cc. 100, 101.
  - vii. The landing in Attica (Hippias), c. 102.
  - viii. The Athenian defence. Note on Miltiades, cc. 103, 104.
  - ix. Summons of the Spartans. Philippides, Pan, cc. 105, 106.
  - x. The dream of Hippias, c. 107.
  - xi. The coming of the Plataeans. Origin of the alliance, c. 108.
  - xii. The Athenian council of war, c. 109.
  - xiii. The battle. Retreat and return, cc. 110-116.
  - xiv. Losses, c. 117.
  - xv. Wonders, c. 117.
  - xvi. The dream of Datis: the Delian statue, c. 118.
  - xvii. Fate of the Eretrian captives, c. 119.
  - xviii. The arrival of the Spartans, c. 120.
  - xix. Problem of the shield; defence of the Alkmaionidae, cc. 121-124.

The above Analysis, in some nineteen articles or numbers, exhibits at once the action and the story, as they appear in the pages of Herodotus; and probably may suggest, when traced in the text, directions in which observations must be sought for the elucidation of the problems of source and authority. Even such an Analysis cannot but be somewhat arbitrary and incomplete; and in particular the passage on the actual battle (cc. 110-116), and its immediate sequel, may seem too summarily disposed of. But in the structure of the Book, and of this sub-division of the main narrative, the description of the actual battle emerges in unmistakable contour. Moreover, the problems connected with it and the immediate context are hereafter discussed with no lack of minuteness.[1]

[1] Appendix X.

Here, therefore, further discussion of this topic may be postponed; nor can the problem of the authenticity of the text, containing the defence of the Alkmaionids, be raised within the limits of this Introduction.[1]

B. It remains to consider, in further detail, the excursus, digressions, asides, notes or similar elements, which remain in the sixth Book, after the three organic sections or stages of the main narrative have been detached. It has, however, already been observed that the elements of direct continuous narrative and of digressional interest are almost inextricably combined in this Book. This contagmination is especially obvious and especially perplexing in two sections or possible sections of the Book, viz., that dealing with the annals of the *triennium* (say, cc. 31 (33)-93), and that dealing with the sequel to Marathon (say, cc. 121 (125)-140). In the other two sections of the Book, which would exist on this hypothesis, viz., the end of the Ionian revolt (cc. 1-32) and the Marathonian campaign (cc. 94-120), the digressions or notes are comparatively short and easily enumerated. As whatever may be the most acceptable arrangement for the exhibition of the fundamental literary structure of this labyrinthine Book, these two passages must in any case be recognised as substantial items or entities in the Analysis, it may be worth while here to recapitulate the short digressions which they contain.

I. The end of the Ionian revolt, cc. 1-32, with short digressions, notes, or parenthetical remarks upon—
- α. The adventures of Dionysios, c. 17.
- β. The capture of Zankle by the Samians, cc. 23 f.
- γ. The divine warnings to Chios, c. 27.

III. The Marathon campaign, cc. 94-120, with digressions, etc., upon—
- α. The earthquake of Delos, c. 98.
- β. The antecedents of Miltiades, cc. 103 f.
- γ. The Athenian cult of Pan, c. 105 *ad fin.*
- δ. The Atheno-Plataean alliance, c. 108.
- ε. Losses, etc., c. 117.

But this table leaves two other passages (II. Annals of the Triennium, cc. 33-93; IV. Sequel to Marathon, cc. 118 (121)-140) unanalysed. The second passage, indeed, may seem to offer less difficulty, though it is not easy to decide where exactly it begins, any one of the following chapters 117, 118, 121,

[1] See notes *ad l.*

125 being possible points of departure. Taking c. 125 as perhaps the least unsatisfactory, the finale of the Book resolves itself into a series of appendices as follows:—

1. Stories of the Alkmaionidae, cc. 125-131.
2. The Parian expedition, and the end of Miltiades, cc. 132-136.
3. The Athenian occupation of Lemnos, cc. 137-140.

But the long and important section, cc. 33-93, remains and defies analysis, the continuous narrative being represented by cc. 33, 41-(46, 48-)51, 61 *ad init.*, 73, the remainder (cc. 34-40, (47), 52-72, 74-93) being devoted to digressions, in which it is almost impossible to maintain chronological order, and not easy throughout even to distinguish between what is Spartan and what is Athenian history. In regard to the chief passage (cc. 52-93), it is, indeed, clear that it begins by being purely Spartan history, and ends by being Athenian or Aigineto-Athenian history, but where the one passes into the other it is not easy to determine. The turning point seems to lie in the record of the appeal of Aigina to Sparta, c. 85, with the visit of Leotychides to Athens, and his reputed speech to the Athenians, c. 86. Speaking roughly, the matter and stories are mainly Spartan from c. 52 to c. 86, and mainly Athenian from c. 87 to c. 93.

Bk. 6. B. Analysis of the Excursus or Digressions, esp. cc. 51-93 (cc. 34-40, on the Philaidae, break the annals of 493 B.C.)

Digressions on the affairs of Sparta and Athens.

i. Story of the origin of the dual kingship, c. 52.

Note.—On the non-Hellenic origin of the Herakleids, cc. 53, 54.

ii. Excursus on the privileges (γέρεα) of the Spartan kings, cc. 55-58.

Note.—On non-Hellenic analogies to Spartan institutions, cc. 59, 60.

[A short passage of the continuous narrative, c. 61 *ad init.*]

iii. Story of the birth of Demaratos, cc. 61-64.

iv. Story of the deposition of Demaratos, cc. 65, 66.

(This story belongs *ex hypothesi* to the chronicle of the year 491-0 B.C., *i.e.* the direct narrative. It also contains a retrospective *note* on the origin of the feud between Demaratos and Leotychides.)

v. Story of the exile of Demaratos, cc. 67-70.

(This story might seem to belong, in Herodotus' conception, to the chronicle of the year before Marathon: but this may be anachronistic. The story includes a λόγος which goes back *ex hypothesi* to events 30-50 years earlier.)

vi. The accession of Leotychides, with *notes*, cc. 71, 72,
1. On Archidamos,
2. On the disgrace and death of Leotychides.
[The intervention of Kleomenes and Leotychides in Aigina is a recurrence to the main narrative of the events of 491-0 B.C., c. 73.]
vii. The exile, restoration and awful death of Kleomenes, with various theories to account for his fate, cc. 74-84;
including an *inset*: Story of the Argive war, cc. 76-82,
with a *note*: On the servile régime at Argos, and its overthrow, c. 83.
viii. The appeal of Aigina to Sparta: Leotychides at Athens. His speech (the story of Glaukos), cc. 85, 86.
ix. Renewal of hostilities between Athens and Aigina, cc. 87-93.

The chronology, or the anachronisms, of this passage, or series of passages, need not here be discussed; suffice it to say that with the exception of the obvious *notes* in cc. 71, 72, 83 we are not justified in concluding that Herodotus reckons any of the events recorded in this context as having occurred subsequently to Marathon. On the contrary, the only fair inference from his arrangement of the facts, or traditions, is that he conceives them all as belonging to a date before Marathon. This conception is, however, almost demonstrably erroneous.[1] The observations upon which this judgment is based, and indeed the point now reached in this expository Analysis, suggest the elucidation, in the next place, of those express notices of post-Marathonian affairs which occur in these Books. The detection of such notices will prepare the way for the recognition of those anachronisms and afterthoughts, which, if they diminish or obscure the historic value of the work in one direction, serve to heighten its interest and evidential value in another.

§ 16. The passages, excursus, sentences or notes in the fourth, fifth, and sixth Books, which assert or imply post-Marathonian dates, are not all of one kind. It is convenient to distinguish the principal classes into which such notices fall:

I. A chronological difference is given and implied by every passage of an autobiographical kind, for obviously the author throughout his main narrative is writing of matters which are remote from his own day. He is not a contemporary authority for the things which form the bulk and the *raison d'être* of his work. There is a difference between the times about

[1] See Appendices VI., VII., VIII.

which he is writing, and the times in which he is writing. Explicit references to his own times,[1] his own experiences,[2] occur throughout the Books, independently of the many passages in which a personal observation, an autobiographical reference, is latent and problematic.[3] Even passages expressing a personal opinion or view are of similar significance in this connexion.[4] To determine the exact dates involved in these particular references is one of the last and most abstruse attempts of constructive criticism. In the final resort these passages contain the most important evidences for the solution of the problems of the time and place, or times and places, of the composition of the work, as a whole, or in its several parts. The dates given or implied in such passages are not, of course, the same, except so far as the author's age or lifetime be regarded as a single period or epoch. An expression of opinion by the author carries us down to the actual moment of composition.[4] A statement of an actual personal experience implies a precise day and hour in his lifetime, if only it could be ascertained.[2] Other references may be less precise, and suggest some chronological margin within the limits of the author's lifetime.[5] But no such passage can be pushed back so as to overcome the chronological interval everywhere implied between the author's present and the past, about which he is writing. There is not, however, in the whole of these three Books any autobiographical passage which serves to determine with any precision the extent of that interval, or even to what generation the author belongs.[6] There is, in short, no exact parallel to such passages as occur in the first[7] and in the last[8] volume of the work; nor even any clear proof that the author

---

[1] In the formulae *ἔτι καὶ ἐς τόδε, καὶ νῦν ἐστί, ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ, μέχρι ἐμέο, et sim.*, and, indeed, all verbs in the present, other than the strictly 'historic' present (*γράφει γράμματα*, 5. 14).

[2] 4. 14; 5. 59.

[3] Cp. § 21 *infra*.

[4] *ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ αὐτὸς πρόσκειμαι, τάδε οἶδα, δοκέειν ἐμοί, et sim. passim.* See further § 22 *infra*. Still more, expressions of intention: *e.g.* 4. 81 *ὧδε δηλώσω*: 82 *ἀναβήσομαι δὲ ἐς τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς ἤια λέξων λόγον* (cp. 5. 62), *et sim.*

[5] 4. 124 *τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν*: 6. 42 *οἳ* (sc. *φόροι*) *κατὰ χώρην διατελέουσι ἔχοντες ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου αἰεὶ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ὡς ἐτάχθησαν ἐξ Ἀρταφρένεος.*

[6] Even the interview with Tymnes, 4. 76, and his connexion with Ariapeithes, Skyles and Sitalkes is inconclusive. An exception might be claimed for the "240 years after the second disappearance of Aristeas," 4. 15. But cp. note *ad l.*

[7] 3. 55.

[8] 9. 16.

had conversed with the Marathonomachae.[1] Other classes of passages or references to post-Marathonian events make it plain that he might have done so; the absence of any clear evidence that he did is therefore all the more remarkable. The chronological hiatus suggests an important gap in the sources or tradition.[2]

II. A second group of references to the author's own days, as distinguished from the times about which he is writing, is created by the numerous notices of the sources from which he is professedly drawing. It is but seldom that a reference to a source, or authority for the writer's statements, is made otherwise than in the present tense. Where the reference is made in the past tense, either the case will clearly fall under the class of passages above noticed (I.),[3] or the author is quoting a previous written authority,[4] or the passage gives rise to a further problem.[5] As a rule, indeed, Herodotus cites his sources in the present tense;[6] his living authorities are his own contemporaries and not the actors or contemporaries of the events which he records; or if dead, they are still speaking. This practice of citing in the present must not, indeed, be made the basis of a narrow inference: it is artificial, literary, unscientific, or inexact. At most it brings the author within his own experience into more or less direct relation with a living tradition, or with an authority *ex hypothesi* verifiable at the time of writing. The phraseology of Herodotus incidentally confirms this impression, which would stand even without confirmation; for he does not draw substantial distinction between the λόγος he has heard at some time or other, and the λόγος he is writing down,[7] nor between the moment of inquiry and the moment of composition or record.[8] The fundamental distinction which remains intact throughout is the chronological

---

[1] 6. 117 is, if anything, against it.

[2] See further, § 20 *infra*.

[3] 4. 16, 76, 77, 81.

[4] 4. 13 ἔφη: 16 ἔφησε, ἔλεγε: 6. 137 ἔλεξε.

[5] ἔλεγον 4. 81; 6. 98.

[6] λέγουσι 4. 5, 8, 14, 15, 33, 105, 150, 154, 155, 173, 184, 187, 195, 196; 5. 10, 22, 44, 49, 57, 85, 86, 87; 6. 52, 54, 134, 137; λέγεται 4. 45, 184, 194, 195; 5. 87; 6. 54; ἔστι λόγος 4. 11, 179 (λεγόμενος); λέγονται 4. 26, 184, 191; 5. 113; 6. 14; λεγόμενα 6. 53; εἰσὶ οἱ λέγοντες 4. 27.

[7] 4. 14 τὸν δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἤκουον λόγον . . λέξω. Ἀριστέην γὰρ λέγουσι κτλ.

[8] 4. 95 ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι: 5. 9 δύναμαι πυθέσθαι: 5. 57 ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω. Above all the passages 4. 36 γελῶ δὲ ὁρέων γῆς περιόδους γράψαντας πολλοὺς ἤδη . . οἳ γράφουσι καὶ ποιεύντων.

interval separating the author's own date, whether of investigation or of composition, from the dates of the events, which form the principal material of his narrative. But the exact determination of that interval is not ascertainable from his notices of the sources from which this portion of the work is derived.

III. A third class of references to the author's Present, or of passages which involve dates subsequent to the battle of Marathon (or to the Parian expedition), may conveniently be made out of a large number or mass of statements referring to existing objects, whether natural or artificial, or existing institutions and customs, or even the present state of nations, tribes, and cities.

From the nature of the case this class includes a prodigious amount of matters, but all with the common quality that they were *ex hypothesi* observable, verifiable by the historian himself and his contemporaries. Not, indeed, all equally verifiable; and so various and separable are the matters to be included in this class, that it is expedient to sub-divide it. One sub-division may contain the geographical and ethnographical passages which form a considerable feature in the literary Analyses of these Books. These passages contain, indeed, theory as well as fact, and errors as well as accurate knowledge; but this criticism does not affect their classification in the present connexion. The historical element in them is very small, from the author's point of view. He does not conceive himself as having to record changes in geographical fact, or events in the physical history of the earth.[1] In the Books here in question he treats the physical environment and conditions of history as permanent and unchanging. Land and seas, mountains, deserts, rivers and lakes are regarded as always the same, or as not altering sufficiently to make the present-day description of them inapplicable to any previous time. Climate, flora and fauna are similarly regarded.

[1] The earthquake in Delos, 6. 98, is a portent. The great convulsion of Thera (Santorin) is unknown to Hdt. See note to 4. 147. There are no eclipses recorded in these Books. Dareios' canal, 4. 39, is hardly an exception, much less Neco's, c. 42. The ἴχνος Ἡρακλέος, 4. 82, is more like one, but not important. The origin of geographical names, 4. 45, is not a physical problem. There is nothing like the passage, 2. 11, on the physical history of the Nile Valley. Hdt. does not 'harmonise' his account of the Scythian campaign with his description of the great rivers by the supposition that the rivers have made their appearance since the time of Dareios.

In describing all these matters Herodotus speaks in the present, on the implied hypothesis that in these respects there has been no historical change.

It is, of course, immaterial for the present purpose, whether the Herodotean descriptions are scientific or not. It may, however, be observed, in passing, that we are to go to Herodotus not so much for information in regard to the actual physical history or condition of the globe as for information in regard to the opinions held on the subject by himself, and those whom he represents or reports. Respecting the flora and fauna, something more may be due to Herodotus. His statements in regard to the area covered by the *silphium*,[1] and in regard to the animals of Libya,[2] deserve attention, even though the silphium has disappeared or degenerated, and the camel, now the chief beast of burden in northern Africa, does not figure in his Libya. All, however, that immediately concerns the present argument or classification is the observation that, if Herodotus makes no difference under this head between past and present, describing the facts or features as they existed, or as he believed them to exist, in his own day, it is because he assumes the facts of his present as valid, in this connexion, for the past, and not because his sources of knowledge for the past history or events, of which the places described were the scenes, contained the geographical descriptions, which form the bulk of the digressions.

It is, perhaps, more remarkable that Herodotus should describe the ethnography, institutions, manners and customs of the natives in Scythia, Thrace and Libya with hardly a hint of any historic perspective. He recognises, indeed, some changes or attempted changes arising from the influence of Greek settlements in Scythia,[3] and in Libya,[4] as also the influence of Egypt upon the Libyans,[5] since the historical period has begun; and the movements or disappearance of some tribes recorded may be thought to affect the political geography or the tribal frontiers of these non-Hellenic lands.[6] But it is obvious, for the most part, that the habitations,

[1] 4. 169. But the statement in regard to the olive, 5. 82, is pragmatic, and Hdt. himself evidently suspects it.

[2] 4. 191, 192.

[3] 4. 17, the Kallippidae; 78 f., story of Skyles; 108, Hellenism in Gelonos; 103, Iphigeneia in Tauris; (95, Salmoxis the Thracian). It is to be regretted that Hdt. did not sketch the history of the Greek settlements in Scythia, as in Libya.

[4] 4. 170, 171, 180.

[5] 4. 168, 180, 186.

[6] 4. 11, 12, the prae-Scythian popu-

the institutions, manners and customs of the uncivilised barbarians are described as they are, or are supposed to be, in his own time. Virtually the whole of the ethnographical and anthropological passages and notes may be segregated from the materials for past history, and classified, with the geographical excursus and notes, as material for the description of the world in the historian's own time, or in the historian's own mind. The exception here proves the rule: the record of change is the exception. The case is widely different with the notices of Greek states, societies, institutions and laws. Here the historical note is uppermost, and the contrast between the historian's own time and the times he is describing almost everywhere expressed, or obviously to be understood. The constitution of Demonax,[1] the Parian settlement of Miletos,[2] the tyrannies of Ionia,[3] or of Peloponnesos,[4] are all here described as things of the past. Though Kleisthenes counts as the founder, or establisher, of the Athenian democracy,[5] it is indicated that changes have been effected even since his day in Athenian institutions,[6] and what is recorded here of that period (519-489 B.C.) must not be taken as a description of existing institutions. Among Greek states Sparta furnishes an exception. Herodotus does, indeed, record a new departure in Spartan custom, or law,[7] but whatever inferences may be drawn from events as recorded by him, the implied assumption in regard to Sparta is that its customs and institutions are fixed in his own time as from the beginning, and where he goes out of his way to describe them, he treats them as matters of present observation.[8] Thus, embedded in a legend of the prime, is to be found the memorable note on the Spartan practice of executing the death penalty at night.[9] More general notices of Hellenic customs of ancient times, still in force, are involved in the remark on the cult of Stesagoras,[10] in the mention of the common gods,[11] and of the fixed rate of ransom among the Peloponnesians.[12] Historic

lation of Scythia; 99, ἡ ἀρχαίη Σκυθική: 22, the Scythian *apostates*; 105, the Neuri; 110, the Sauromatae; 173, the Psylli.

[1] 4. 161. [2] 5. 29.

[3] 4. 138; 5. 38; 6. 43, etc.

[4] 5. 67, 92; 6. 126.

[5] 5. 69; 6. 131.

[6] 6. 109 (τὸ παλαιόν); 111 (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τότε εἶχε οὕτω); 5. 71 contains a still earlier contrast; 6. 116 carries implicitly a political difference.

[7] 5. 75. [8] 6. 56-60.

[9] 4. 146 κτείνουσι δὲ τοὺς ἂν κτείνωσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι νυκτός, μετ' ἡμέρην δὲ οὐδένα.

[10] 6. 38.

[11] 5. 49, 92 *ad fin.*

[12] 6. 79, cp. 5. 77.

differences are implied in the remarks on the origin of Greek writing,[1] the changes in dress,[2] the institution of slavery.[3] These contrasts lie outside the limit of the direct narrative in these Books (519-489 B.C.) Speaking generally it may be said that, where no express notice of change occurs, Herodotus may be assumed to hold that Hellenic customs, religious and political, have not undergone appreciable change between the day of Marathon and his own time.[4]

IV. Fourthly, in this class of references may be placed the list of passages in which Herodotus notices monuments, works of art, or similar objects still extant in his own day, though not, as a rule, works of his contemporaries. In some cases explicitly, in others at least implicitly, the notices of such objects contain the note of contrast between 'now' and 'then.'[5] Among these notices it is hardly necessary to include the names of cities, except, indeed, where Herodotus asserts or implies the rebuilding of this or that city in the interval between the time of which he is writing and the time at which he is writing: as for example Gelonos,[6] or Barke,[7] or Sardis, or the Ionian cities generally,[8] and Miletos with its temples in particular,[9] or again Sybaris,[10] or Athens itself.[11] But short of cities, or their walls and buildings as a whole, works of less magnitude are even more in evidence. Thus Herodotus notices expressly as still extant and visible, and therefore verifiable, the tomb of the Kimmerian chiefs,[12] as well as some Kimmerian fortifications in Scythia,[13] perhaps merely earth-works; likewise the remains of the eight forts ascribed to Dareios on the river Oaros.[14] A very explicit passage asserts the existence of a huge bronze bowl at Exampaios in Scythia[15] at the moment of writing, and the same passage records a krater set up by Pausanias at

---

1 5. 58.

2 5. 88, cp. 4. 180.

3 6. 137.

4 The Persian method of *netting* a population is described in the present (σαγηνεύουσι) *à propos* of operations belonging to the year 493 B.C., cp. note *ad l.*

5 4. 160 (τότε καὶ νῦν); 5. 62 (νῦν ἐόντα τότε δὲ οὔκω); 5. 67 (ἦν καὶ ἔστι), etc.

6 4. 108, cp. with 123. But Hdt. seems hardly conscious of this instance.

7 4. 160; 5. 102.

8 6. 32 τὰς πόλιας ἐνεπίμπρασαν αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἱροῖσι.

9 6. 18 f.

10 5. 44 f.; 6. 21.

11 5. 77.

12 4. 11 ἔτι δῆλός ἐστι ὁ τάφος.

13 4. 12 καὶ νῦν ἔστι μὲν ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ Κιμμέρια τείχεα.

14 4. 124 τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν.

15 4. 81 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χώρῳ κέεται χαλκήιον κτλ.

the mouth of the Pontos as an object which any one might still go and see.[1] Other passages, without actually asserting the existence of the objects or monuments named, may be taken to imply so much. The inscribed *stelae* of Dareios used by the Byzantines for the altar of Artemis, and the one stone left lying by the temple of Dionysos, were surely in existence in the writer's time, though he does not happen to say so explicitly.[2] In regard to the inscription on the Tearos we may the more admire his reserve.[3] It will be generally conceded that it is more probable that there were artificial mounds of stone on the Arteskos, in the territory of the Odrysae, than that it was Dareios who erected them;[4] but the description of the lake-dwellings in Lake Prasias[5] must rank as one of the most valuable contributions made by Herodotus to the description of antiquities extant in his own time, whatever the origin of his knowledge in the matter may have been. Whether the wall across the isthmus of the Thracian Chersonese was in existence in his time Herodotus does not expressly signify.[6] It was a structure with a long and interesting history, and Miltiades was probably not the first and certainly not the last to be busy with it. The bridge over the Bosporos had utterly disappeared long before the historian's time,[7] but who can doubt that the picture and epigram of Mandrokles were still to be seen in the Heraion at Samos, even though Herodotus merely records the historical fact of the offering having been made?[8] More explicit is the notice of the krater adorned with griffins' heads, and supported by three kneeling colossi, offered by Kolaios and his crew, and still to be seen in the Heraion as Herodotus wrote.[9] In the Agora of Samos stands, the historian records, a *stele*, on which were inscribed the names of those eleven trierarchs who had not betrayed the common cause at Lade,[10] though they may have been afterwards among the treacherous freebooters who seized the fair city of Zankle.[11] At Metapontion, in the Agora, was still standing, the historian notes, a statue of Aristeas side by side with that of Apollo, amid a bower of laurels.[12]

---

[1] 4. 81 *ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω τοῦτον, ὧδε δηλώσω.* [2] 4. 87.

[3] 4. 91.

[4] 4. 92.

[5] 5. 16.

[6] 6. 36.

[7] 4. 87 *ad fin.*

[8] 4. 89 *ταῦτα μέν νυν τοῦ ζεύξαντος τὴν γέφυραν μνημόσυνα ἐγένετο.*

[9] 4. 152 *πέριξ δὲ αὐτοῦ γρυπῶν κεφαλαὶ πρόκροσσοί εἰσι.*

[10] 6. 14 *ἔστι αὕτη ἡ στήλη ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ.*

[11] 6. 22-24.

[12] 4. 15 *καὶ νῦν ἕστηκε ἀνδριὰς κτλ.*

On the Krathis stood the shrine of Athene, dating but from the time of Dorieus, or the Sybarites, in the historian's own time, could not have been appealing to it as evidence[1] against the grants enjoyed by the Iamidae at Kroton.[2] At Egesta the Heroon of Philip, a man of divine beauty, is in honour.[3] The shrine of fair Helen may still be seen in Therapne above the shrine of Phoibos;[4] the Adrasteion is where it was, in the Agora of Sikyon.[5] The temple of Delphi had been consumed by fire, but it stood in the historian's time as completed by Kleisthenes the Athenian.[6] Hard by, in the Corinthian treasury, was lying a work of art well worth seeing, the censer presented by Evelthon of Kypros.[7] At Thebes there were still to be seen inscribed offerings, which the historian thought might throw some light upon the early history of writing,[8] and help to connect the Greek alphabet with the Phoenician: at Athens separate shrines attested the presence of the Kadmeian strangers,[9] not less surely than the huge heap of refuse in Thasos, the work of early Phoenician explorers.[10]

In regard to the Athens of his own day these books of Herodotus are, indeed, remarkably important. The conflagration in 480 B.C. had made of Athens and of its Akropolis a new city.[11] This great event and its consequences Herodotus takes for granted: the wonder for him is, perhaps, that any remnants or monuments of the older Athens survive. It is not, indeed, clear whether he conceived Marathonian, or Peisistratid, Athens to have been a walled town,[12] nor has he occasion to notice specifically the Themistoklean walls, unless indeed the description of the burial place of Kimon involve such a reference.[13] The tomb of Anchimolios at Alopeke hard by the Herakleion in Kynosargos, leaves the problem undecided.[14] It is on the Akropolis that

---

[1] 5. 45 ἀποδεικνύουσι.

[2] 5. 45 τὰ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι ἐνέμοντο οἱ Καλλίεω ἀπόγονοι.

[3] 5. 47 ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ τάφου αὐτοῦ ἡρώιον ἱδρυσάμενοι θυσίῃσι αὐτὸν ἱλάσκονται.

[4] 6. 61 τὸ δ' ἔστι ἐν τῇ Θεράπνῃ καλεομένῃ ὕπερθε τοῦ Φοιβηίου ἱροῦ.

[5] 5. 67 ἡρώιον γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγορῇ τῶν Σικυωνίων Ἀδρήστου τοῦ Ταλαοῦ.

[6] 2. 180; 5. 62 τὸν νηὸν . . τὸν νῦν ἐόντα τότε δὲ οὔκω.

[7] 4. 162 ὃς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θυμιητήριον ἐὸν ἀξιοθέητον ἀνέθηκε, τὸ ἐν τῷ Κορινθίων θησαυρῷ κέεται.

[8] 5. 59-61, cp. notes *ad l.*

[9] 5. 61 καί σφι ἱρά ἐστι κτλ.

[10] 6. 47.

[11] 5. 77.

[12] See notes, 5. 64; 6. 103, and Appendix X.

[13] 6. 103 τέθαπται δὲ Κίμων πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος πέρην τῆς διὰ Κοίλης καλεομένης ὁδοῦ.

[14] 5. 63 Ἀγχιμολίου εἰσὶ ταφαὶ τῆς

attention is concentrated by the natural course of the story. The 'Pelasgic wall' is mentioned as something that requires no explanation,[1] but the grotto of Pan, in which ever since the day of Marathon the Arkadian god has been worshipped year by year, is located under the Akropolis.[2] The temple and statue, mentioned in connexion with the sacrilegious attempt of the Spartan Kleomenes,[3] cannot have been in existence in the historian's own time, and the temple behind the walls, which still showed traces of the Medic fire, must have been a restoration,[4] like the walls themselves. Herodotus may have seen the fetters in which the Boeotian prisoners had erst been bound,[5] though the notice of them does not fix a date for his sight of them: nor does he seem to have asked himself how these and other monuments had escaped the effects of the Persian invasion: and in particular the *Quadriga* standing on the left hand immediately as you enter the Propylaea with the epigram (of Simonides) on the base.[6] The importance of this reference can, indeed, hardly be exaggerated. The monument seen by Herodotus is probably a Periklean restoration, perhaps a *replica* of the older one, but not dating earlier than the Thirty Years' truce.[7] The Propylaea can hardly be any other than the Periklean Propylaea, finished in the year 433 B.C.[8] Even so, this notice does not supply the latest date recorded or implied in the work of Herodotus, but it fits in with other passages to give precision to the date of the composition, or revision of his work. Finally, in the holy island of Delos are monumental objects, as Herodotus writes, which serve to keep alive or to confirm traditions which he records: the tomb of the Hyperborean maidens Hyperoche and Laodike,[9] the coffin of the maidens Arge

---

Ἀττικῆς Ἀλωπεκῆσι, ἀγχοῦ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ ἐν Κυνοσάργεϊ: cp. 6. 116, a passage which also marks the difference between old and new Athens in respect to the change of arsenal (*Φαλήρου, τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ἐπίνειον τότε τῶν Ἀθηναίων*).

[1] 5. 64, but cp. 6. 137.

[2] 6. 105, but cp. p. lxiv *infra*.

[3] 5. 71, 72.

[4] 5. 77. See note *ad l.*

[5] 5. 77 *αἵ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι, κρεμάμεναι ἐκ τειχέων περιπεφλευσμένων πυρὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μήδου, ἀντίον δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἑσπέρην τετραμμένου.* The shield and spear of Alkaios hanging in the Athenaion at Sigeion may, or may not, be a parallel, the present (*ἴσχουσι*) there being an historic present (5. 95).

[6] 5. 77.

[7] See notes *ad l.*

[8] Note *ad l.*; Curtius, *Stadtg. v. Athen*, 147 ff. On the *temenos* of Aiakos in the Agora, cp. note to 5. 89 and Appendix VIII., § 3.

[9] 4. 34 *τὸ δὲ σῆμά ἐστι ἔσω ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπιπέφυκε δέ οἱ ἐλαίη.*

and Opis, who had come to Delos from the same region still earlier;[1] the great altar, whereon Datis had made a lordly offering,[2] not many weeks before Marathon.

It is impossible to review this last batch of references without suspecting that the objects recorded or described in them were pregnant with historic associations, and must be taken into account, when the sources from which Herodotus drew his knowledge come to be reckoned up. The same remark applies with even more force to a further batch of references, which might here be brought into view, but may still more conveniently be postponed. Yet, in enumerating the monuments of the past, extant in the time of Herodotus, of which he was cognisant, and made use, while they marked for him a difference between the past and the present, the schedule would be incomplete without notice of the literary documents, tangible and material evidences in their way, which had come down to him from earlier authors. The line between the inscribed stone or metal and the book is a fine one, and it might be a mere accident whether a saying of Simonides were quoted from the one or from the other.[3] But economy and convenience dictate here the postponement of the passages illustrating the use made by Herodotus of books, and such written documents. They may be more conveniently considered under the head of his sources.

V. Events[4] subsequent to Marathon, and most of them subsequent even to the siege of Sestos in 479-8 B.C.,[5] are mentioned incidentally in these Books, and serve to determine with some precision the date of their composition or revision. From the date of Marathon to the date of the last of the events, so noticed, is a period of about sixty years. It is not possible to fix each of them to a particular year, or even in all cases to a particular decade, and in no case does the date of the event decide in itself the date of the passage in which it occurs; but as such references are historical, not prophetic, they fix an upward limit, and they tend to fix a lower limit for the collection of materials, and for the actual composition of the work.

---

[1] 4. 35 ἡ δὲ θήκη αὐτέων ἐστὶ ὄπισθε τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου, πρὸς ἠῶ τετραμμένη, ἀγχοτάτω τοῦ Κηίων ἱστιητορίου. See notes *ad ll.*

[2] 6. 97, cp. 4. 35.

[3] 5. 102, cp. with 5. 77.

[4] It seems hardly worth while to specify *persons* apart from *events*, as in almost every case the events are acts or associated with persons, in some way.

[5] 9. 114-121.

The Median war, that is to say, the invasion of 480 B.C., is itself referred to explicitly in more than one passage,[1] and less expressly in some others.[2] And certain passages refer to events which occurred between the dates of Marathon and the invasion of Xerxes. If the Parian expedition belong to the continuous narrative of the sixth Book, yet the notice of the payment of the fine of 50 T. by Kimon must belong to a somewhat later point, though probably in this decade.[3] The exact age of Perikles at his death is unknown, but his mother's dream, or at least his own birth, may fall after Marathon.[4] The establishment of Nikodromos and his fellow-exiles at Sunion appears to be dated by Herodotus after Marathon,[5] even though the conspiracy which resulted in his exile is dated before. The Olympiad of Alexander[6] is not easily determined, but might conceivably fall as late as 488 or 484 B.C. The rebellion of Aryandes[7] can hardly be identified with the revolt of Egypt after Marathon;[8] and therefore, although expressly post-dated in the text, where it occurs, probably belongs to the period within the express *termini* of these Books, though the mention of the Aryandic silver, still in circulation, brings the event down to the moment of composition. In regard to this group of eventful notices there is not one that can be very precisely dated. About ten or twelve references occur in these Books to occurrences between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars. In regard to some of these, dealing primarily with Persian affairs, we must be content to date them within the limits of the reign of Xerxes, viz., the mission and end of Sataspes,[9] perhaps the death of Skythes at the Persian court,[10] and even the upbringing of the sons of Metiochos.[11] Still more precisely is it possible to date the suit of Pausanias the Spartan for the hand of an Achaemenid princess, whether the lady was daughter of Xerxes, or of Megabates,[12] while Herodotus himself defines the period for the restoration of the gilded statue to Delion.[13] The accession of Archidamos is involved in the notice of the end of Leotychides,[14] and the passage therefore carries

[1] 5. 77, 102.
[2] *e.g.* 6. 98.
[3] 6. 136.
[4] 6. 131.
[5] 6. 90.
[6] 5. 22. See note *ad l.*
[7] 4. 166.
[8] 7. 1.
[9] 4. 43. Xerxes is named four times in the passage.
[10] 6. 24 ἐς ὃ γήραϊ μέγα ὄλβιος ἐὼν ἐτελεύτησε ἐν Πέρσῃσι.
[11] 6. 41.
[12] 5. 32. About 476 B.C. Cp. note *ad l.*
[13] 6. 118 δι' ἐτέων εἴκοσι. About 470 B.C.
[14] 6. 71, 72.

us down into the 'sixties,' within which decade also fall the destruction of Tiryns.[1] The sack of the Lepreatis can hardly be dated before the close of the third Messenian war, and approaches the middle of the fifth century B.C., a date which Herodotus expressly regards as falling in his own times.[2] The establishment of the Pan-cult on the Akropolis may fall after the Medic war[3] in the days when Kimon, son of Miltiades, was the leading man in Athens, while in the implied expulsion of the Pelasgi from Lemnos and Imbros might lurk a reference to the Athenian kleruchies established by Perikles after the Thirty Years' truce.[4] The most precise and interesting passages are those that may be more or less plausibly referred to the Peloponnesian war and its immediate circumstances. Of these cases there are at least three in the present Books. The expulsion of the Aiginetans from their island[5] can scarcely be referred to any other event than that recorded by Thucydides, and dated precisely to 431 B.C.,[6] a time when ideas connected with sacrilege were in the air.[7] If the Delian earthquake recorded by Herodotus[8] be identified with the one recorded by Thucydides,[9] the same epoch may be reached; and in any case the reference in the passage to the Persian kings, and to the struggles of the Hellenic *Koryphaei* for supremacy, even though Artaxerxes be not dead, nor the Ten Years' war already half over when the passage was first writ, still brings us within measurable distance of its outbreak. To the same period has by some scholars been referred the passage recording the fate of Skyles, and the composition effected on the Danube by Oktamasades and Sitalkes.[10] But Sitalkes was an interesting personage some years before the Peloponnesian war, and the historical and chronological requirements would be satisfied even if the extradition of Skyles were dated 12-15 years before the revolt of Potidaia; though, doubtless, elsewhere in Herodotus we have indubitable evidence of the mportance of the Thracian king at that precise moment.[11]

§ 17. There remains to be noticed a number of passages, in which events are recorded belonging to dates subsequent to

---

[1] 6. 83.

[2] 4. 148 ἐπ' ἐμέο.

[3] 6. 105 καταστάντων σφι εὖ ἤδη τῶν πρηγμάτων.

[4] 5. 27.

[5] 6. 91 ἔφθησαν ἐκπεσόντες πρότερον ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἤ σφι ἵλεον γενέσθαι τὴν θεόν.

[6] Thuc. 2. 27.

[7] Thuc. 1. 126 ff.

[8] 6. 98.

[9] Thuc. 2. 8. But cp. § 21 *infra, ad fin.*

[10] 4. 78-80.

[11] 7. 137. Cp. Thuc. 2. 29.

Marathon, though Herodotus has anachronistically ante-dated them. The oracle, which presupposes eight Battiad princes, may be taken to belong to this class,[1] and with it may rank the oracles foretelling the subjugation of Aigina by Athens,[2] and the prophecies of Hippias touching the days when Corinth should suffer grievously at the hands of Athens.[3] The verifications of these oracles all fall well before the middle of the century, for even the last did not wait its fulfilment till the quarrel over Korkyra; but belonging, as they do, to the main texture of the narrative, and having less the air of subsequent additions, they are of especial weight in determining the date of composition; unless, indeed, they are to be regarded as genuine prophecies. A more subtle anachronism may lurk in the figure assigned to the total number of Athenian male citizens at the time of the visit of Aristagoras.[4] In three other cases Herodotus has apparently dated before Marathon events in Spartan history, which should have been placed thereafter: (1) the flight of Demaratos from Sparta to Asia;[5] (2) the death of Kleomenes, with its immediate antecedents;[6] (3) the visit of Leotychides to Athens.[7] To these must be added (4) the records of the warfare between Aigina and Athens growing immediately out of them.[8] The occurrence in the latter context of a notice which must be dated to 431 B.C., does not necessarily carry the whole story down to that date; but, in any case, as all these events may be dated to the decade between Marathon (490 B.C.) and Salamis (480 B.C.), ample time is allowed for the distortion of the true sequence and perspective, before the date at which Herodotus compiled the narrative in these Books.

The greatest and the subtlest anachronism of all still remains to be discovered; it is the anachronistic spirit, or tone, which pervades the whole story, or series of stories, forming the continuous narrative of the Persian campaigns, and even the Hellenic record for the years 519-489 B.C. as given in these Books. This tone is traceable in the main to two closely related causes: (1) the tendency to review the memories, the traditions, the whole bequest of that generation in the light of later events, especially in the light of the 'Medic war,' and the final victory of the

---

[1] 4. 163.
[2] 5. 89.
[3] 5. 93.
[4] 5. 97.
[5] 6. 67-70.
[6] 6. 74, 75.
[7] 6. 85, 86.
[8] 6. 87-93. Cp. Appendix VIII.

Greeks; (2) the tendency to impart a moral or quasi-religious meaning to the story, or stories, of the past. Both tendencies combine to substitute afterthoughts for the simple record of facts. In some cases even more immediate interests, of a personal or political kind, may have to be reckoned with. No critical student can cite any story, or even any statement from these Books, as historic or authoritative, without having satisfied himself whether, and to what extent, the passage betrays the influence of this subtle pragmatism. It is much more obviously present in some cases than in others, and where least apparent is, of course, most detrimental. Every one can see that the story of the Scythian expedition is largely a romance to illustrate a moral; that the sin (*ὕβρις*) of Dareios is there pilloried, even as the sin of Kyros, of Kambyses, of Xerxes elsewhere: but it is not always perceived that the story of the defeat of Xerxes is, perhaps, the older story, and even Grote accepted the account of the conduct of the Ionians at the Danube, without inquiring how far it was a fiction framed in the interests of Miltiades, and of Athens. It has not generally been considered to what extent the accounts of the Ionians and their conduct throughout these Books have been affected by later situations and later interests. The unfavourable judgment upon them, put into the mouths of the barbarous Scyths,[1] is not seriously qualified by their subsequent struggle for liberty against Persians and despots; Dareios took their measure,[2] and the story of the revolt, and specially its finale at Lade, exhibit their weakness and incapacity. Whether the ill-will shown to the Ionians is to any extent due to the personal animus of the Dorian writer, who leaves the treatment and behaviour of the Dorian Greeks in Asia out of account throughout this story, is not an unfair question. It is at the expense of Ionians, if at all, that Herodotus betrays a little malice. Otherwise he might have found a better reason for the reforms of Kleisthenes at Athens than the one which he assigns as his own deliberate judgment.[3] It is at the geography of the Ionians that the Dorian laughs,[4] and against his own greatest predecessor, an Ionian statesman and historian, that he seems to

---

[1] 4. 142.

[2] 5. 105. Cp. 2. 1.

[3] 5. 69 *δοκέειν ἐμοὶ καὶ οὗτος ὑπεριδὼν Ἴωνας κτλ.*: cp. 1. 143 *οἱ μέν νυν ἄλλοι Ἴωνες καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔφυγον τὸ οὔνομα, οὐ βουλόμενοι Ἴωνες κεκλῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν φαίνονταί μοι οἱ πολλοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τῷ οὐνόματι.*

[4] 4. 36.

bear a somewhat special grudge.[1] Yet, after all, Herodotus pays Ionia the compliment of writing in Ionic,[2] and of going to Ionic sources for a good deal of his history, which is, moreover, to some extent a not unfriendly history of Ionian states.[3] Even here the discoloration of his narratives is arguably due more to the condition of his sources than to personal bias or ill-will.[4] The conduct of the Ionians on the Danube comes from a tainted and interested source, and in any case the discredit, such as it is, lay primarily with the tyrants, whose political dependence on the Persian it is one of the merits of the story to exhibit.[5] The story of the Ionian revolt looks, in part, like a justification of the Athenian hegemony and empire.[6] The Athenians could insist upon their 'metropolitan' relation to the Ionians, when it suited them.[7] Grote, in his politic way, drew a parallel and contrast between the battle of Lade and the battle of Salamis, and pointed the moral, that it justified the subsequent overlordship of Athens:[8] he forgot, however, to ask how far this moral had already been at the making of the story. Of a truth the moral of the three enslavements of Ionia[9] was that the Ionians were incapable of liberty, and had but a choice of masters. This judgment is historically verified; but the particular stories which illustrate it may have been affected in the telling by the foregone conclusion. Moreover, it was difficult to do justice to the almost unaided and all but successful effort of Ionia to emancipate itself from foreign and domestic lords, without seeming to censure the policy and inaction of Athens and of Sparta during the revolt.[10]

The anachronistic spirit, the element of afterthought, are nowhere more conspicuously present than in the story of Marathon.

---

[1] 5. 36, 125 f.; 6. 137 f. (2. 143). The absence of any clear acknowledgment of the works of Hekataios among his own sources (notwithstanding 2. 123) is not a proper indictment against Herodotus; but the omission of the name of Hekataios in 6. 42 (cp. Diodor. 10. 25) is suspicious.

[2] Ionic of one sort was his native language, cp. Hicks, *Manual*, No. 21. But Hdt.'s style is literary not lapidary.

[3] *e.g.* Samos 6. 14; Miletos 5. 28; Chios 6. 27.

[4] ἀλλήλους γὰρ καταιτιῶνται, 6. 14.

[5] 4. 137 ff.

[6] The story was not given its present state until after the time when the process of converting Ionian allies into subjects had been inaugurated on the principles explained by Thucydides, 1. 99.

[7] 5. 97 (cp. 9. 106); 6. 21 (οἰκήια κακά).

[8] iii. 510, 512 f.

[9] 6. 32.

[10] Cp. further on the point notes to 4. 36, 77, 95, 137-142; 5. 28, 49, 58, 66, 69, 88, 97, 98, 103, 105, 106, 109, 112, 124 f.; 6. 3, 7, 11-15, 21, 32, 42 f., 96 f., 112, 137 f.

In spite of the consciousness that things have changed in Athens since then, even the constitutional position is misconceived, and in other respects there is hardly an element in the later Marathonian legend which is not already present in the story as told by Herodotus. One legitimate conclusion from this observation is in favour of assigning a relatively late date to the compilation of that story. This topic is, however, so fully discussed elsewhere[1] that it is needless to pursue it farther in this place. It is not, however, merely in the three great subjects, which occupy respectively the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus, that the influence of late reflection upon the story of the past may be detected supplying elements of moral and literary motive, as in the story of the Scythic campaign; of political bias, as in the accounts of the Ionian revolt and the Ionians generally; of patriotic exultation, as in the story of Marathon: the same influence is to be discovered, here more strongly, there more mildly, in almost every compact and complete story in these Books, whether belonging to the direct narrative, or to one or other of the numerous asides. If the story of Pheretime's revenge suggests a pious moral,[2] the story of the escape of Kyrene from the Persian yoke is a transparent apology for the unpatriotic attitude of that state in the Medic wars.[3] The story of Alexander and the young men in women's apparel lies under similar suspicion.[4] The story of the Naxian expedition can hardly be taken *au pied de la lettre*.[5] The story of the reception of Aristagoras at Sparta is largely a *suppressio veri* and a *suggestio falsi*.[6] The account of the first campaign of Mardonios is plainly coloured by the desire to discredit one of the most brilliant enemies of Hellas.[7] In his account of the Parian expedition Herodotus has almost demonstrably gone out of his way to prefer a less historical version in the interests of a moral theory.[8]

The case is not very different with the stories which have little or nothing to do with the Persian wars. Afterthought of one kind or another has been at the making of them, and has diminished their historical authority. They are not pure traditions or memorials, they are inversions, or perversions, of the facts to an extent varying from case to case. The story of the

[1] Cp. Appendix X.
[2] 4. 205.
[3] 4. 203.
[4] 5. 18-20.
[5] 5. 32-34.
[6] 5. 49-51.
[7] 6. 43-45.
[8] 6. 132-135.

Minyae at Sparta inverts the actual facts in the political interests of the existing situation.[1] The stories of the colonisation of Thera and of Kyrene are similarly, if not to the same extent, affected by existing interests.[2] The story of the origin of the dual royalty is manifestly an aetiological fiction.[3] The records of Sparta, in the reign of Kleomenes, form a series of stories, in which the pragmatic or fictitious elements vary from comparative innocence and obscurity in the account of Dorieus,[4] to the astounding impositions to be detected in the stories of the Argive war,[5] and of the death of Kleomenes.[6] It is comparatively well with us, when instead of a rationalised history we have good anecdotes, the saving of Kypselos,[7] the advice of Thrasybulos,[8] the necromancy of Periandros,[9] the wealth of Alkmaion,[10] the wedding of Agariste,[11] the horrors of Lemnos:[12] for in these cases the reader, who could fail to suspect the presence of the 'well-born falsehood,' is capable of accepting the story of the Clever Thief[13] as sober history, and must be left to provide his own canons of historic probability.

§ 18. A very erroneous impression would remain if the detection and exposure of the large element of fiction, of afterthought, the sport of fancy or the more calculated result of local interests, were to be taken as depriving the tales told by Herodotus of substantial historical value, or denying to Herodotus the possession of a critical faculty. The true appreciation of the historical value of the work of Herodotus does not lie simply in the substitution of one point of view for another. Doubtless the damage undergone in depreciating his work regarded as history of a past that was past to him, is compensated to a greater or less extent by the gain which accrues from discovering in it traces, evidences, influences of his own times, which are past to us. But the historical value of the work of Herodotus is very far from exhausted by that consolatory substitution of a history of the author's present for the author's history of the past. It must, of course, be remembered that there is much in the work which professedly deals with matter open to the writer's own observation, either actual or potential; all that must rank now as historical, in the first degree, saving so far as exception is taken

---

[1] 4. 145 ff.
[2] 4. 150 ff.
[3] 6. 52.
[4] 5. 39-45.
[5] 6. 76-82.
[6] 6. 74 f.
[7] 5. 92.
[8] 5. 92.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] 6. 125.
[11] 6. 126-130.
[12] 6. 138.
[13] 2. 121.

successfully, on the score of deliberate and wilful misstatement—of which in these three Books there is little or none established: or so far as allowance has to be made for scientific error, as in geographical measurements and so on—in which cases the matter falls into the second degree, and remains valuable as a contribution to the history of science and of literature. But over and above all matters belonging professedly to his own time, or reducible to a value of that kind, the historical value of the work of Herodotus must be sought in the results of two applications of critical method. In the first place, it is but seldom in the work of Herodotus that we are dealing with mere myths, even mere legends, against the utilisation of which, for historical purposes, Grote brought a heavy, perhaps an irrefutable, indictment.[1] In the stories told by Herodotus we are dealing, almost invariably, with historic persons and with historic conditions. It is doubtless partly due to this cause that in a large number of cases, even where other evidences, literary or monumental, direct or indirect, are not forthcoming, the attempt may still be made, not without success, to sift the fact from the fiction, and to determine, with some probability, the actual course of events. Not very much reflection is required to show that our knowledge today of the course of Greek history and affairs for the generation that closed the sixth and opened the fifth century B.C. is based mainly upon the work of Herodotus; and the period (519-489 B.C.) covered by these Books may be extended with no less assurance at least ten years later, and may be run back at least to the age of Peisistratos,[2] if not to the age of Gyges and Psammetichos, when the whole work is taken into the account. Beyond that epoch an indefinite vista opens back into the origins of Hellenic and non-Hellenic societies, to which the contribution of Herodotus is not inconsiderable. The one simple test of the transcendent value of the work of Herodotus as a substantial basis and source for ancient history is the question: What would the world now-a-days know of the subject if the work of Herodotus had never been written? The one fatal error is to

---

[1] The historical value of myths and legends, by the way, is distinctly on the rise again. Recent research seems to show that although myth and legend, taken by themselves, are almost worse than useless, yet taken in connexion with other evidences, archaeological and anthropological, they yield a valuable deposit.

[2] ταῦτα πρὸ τῆς Πεισιστράτου ἡλικίης ἐγένετο, 5. 71.

treat the work, in each of its three parts, in every Book, in each natural sub-division, in each particular story, or anecdote, as equally historical or unhistorical, as equally valuable or valueless, for historical purposes. The historical value of the work varies from volume to volume, from Book to Book, from chapter to chapter, almost from sentence to sentence. But if the time is gone by when the work could be dismissed as a 'pack of lies,' the time is equally gone by when the mere citation of a Book and chapter of Herodotus can be taken as definitive. The nature of the statement in itself, the nature of the context, agreement or difference with other statements, or with alternative versions, the source, obvious or probable, the interest, if any, and the general probabilities of the case must all be reckoned with before positive authority is conceded; doubtless with the result that, in a large number of cases, the version, account or statement of facts preserved by Herodotus will be dismissed as untrue, or at best admitted as possible.

In the second place, it is worth while to observe that there is a mass of particular statements of fact in the work of Herodotus, which may pass almost unchallenged into the historical order. The work of Herodotus is an artful maze or labyrinth of particular stories, held together by a master plan: many, perhaps the majority, of these stories are artistically complete, each in itself. But such art is suspect. It is the incomplete story, the casual reference, the statement of fact, which has little or no relation to its context, which is most likely, *caeteris paribus*, to be historical. Where no other purpose is to be served by a statement, the purpose served is the purely historical interest. Where a statement occurs, not as part of a more or less obviously pragmatic story, but simply because it is in itself known to the author and worthy of mention, the probability is that the statement is true. For example, the very fact that the notice of the Phoenician circumnavigation of Libya occurs in the fourth Book,[1] and not as an item in a systematic account of the maritime policy of Neco in the second Book, is an additional argument in favour of its historic reality. Again, the story of the Scythic expedition is mainly fictitious, but the casual notice that Dareios recrossed into Asia from Sestos,[2] an action apparently inconsequent and not

[1] 4. 42. [2] 4. 143.

explained, is eminently credible on that very account. The story of the interview between Kleomenes and Aristagoras[1] is open to many adverse criticisms; but who will doubt the mention of the *pinax* exhibited by Aristagoras to be based upon a genuine Spartan memory?[2] The story of the Plataean alliance makes Kleomenes a chief agent;[3] this detail, and indeed the whole story, is all the more authoritative seeing that Herodotus has not rationalised the matter by bringing it into chronological conformity with the expeditions of Kleomenes recorded in the fifth Book. Conversely, it seems more probable that the conspiracy of Nikodromos in Aigina[4] is genuine history than that it is correctly chronologised, for it occurs in a context where Herodotus seems to have lost his way in an inconsequent attempt to systematise the history of the Aigineto-Athenian feud.

§ 19. As hardly anything is known of Herodotus apart from what is to be learnt from his work,[5] it is small profit to argue from his character or reputation apart from the work. But the analytical estimate of the historical authority of the work in its various component parts, divisions, elements and factors may seem unsatisfactory to two classes of students: those, on the one hand, who have appraised the whole work in every part at the value to be set upon its best elements; those, on the other hand, who have involved the whole and every part in a condemnation, hardly justifiable even if limited to its weakest spots. But the times are now favourable for a discriminative verdict, and the methods indicated in the preceding pages, and applied in those which follow, will probably commend themselves to scholars and historians as sound, however great the difference of opinion may be on the results in detail. Perfect agreement cannot be expected in regard to particular cases and passages. It should, however, be universally recognised that the most stringent application of historical and critical methods to the text of Herodotus leaves the work irremovably and irreplaceably at the head of European prose literature, whether in its scientific or in its artistic character. To those capable of realising intelligently the conditions under which

[1] 5. 49-51.

[2] See Grote iii. 497. The map made more sensation at Sparta than at Athens.

[3] 6. 108.

[4] 6. 88-90.

[5] The external evidences are purposely excluded from the purview of this *Introduction* to the three Books contained in this volume; the internal evidences, so far as they are obtainable from these Books, are considered § 21 *infra*.

Herodotus collected and composed his materials, the growing wonder must be the triumphant issue of his labour in a work which is not merely a monument of his own genius, a mirror of his own times, but an almost inexhaustible treasury of knowledge respecting times that were to him, as to us, past and gone. It must be admitted that a writer capable of offering readers or hearers such a story as the story of the Scythian expedition for a sober or serious version of actual events, does not compose history on our principles, and falls far short of the standard announced by his junior contemporary Thucydides.[1] On the other hand, it may be easily perceived that a premature application of the methods of Thucydides to the subject, or great series of subjects, which form the theme of Herodotus, might only have led to a result of far less historical value and authority than the actual work now in our hands. Herodotus might have gained consistency and forfeited truth: exterminated the evidences and obtained a personal verdict: established his own authority by obliterating his authorities. His method of telling stories has preserved more history for us than would otherwise have survived the later and more systematic pragmatism of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. He is for us the first historian because he is the last, or at any rate the best of the Logographers. He preserves the historic material even where he does not use it historically. His merits as a writer, as an artist, as a prose-poet are generally recognised. It is something to have written the best story-book in Greek literature, perhaps in European literature. No other Greek writer has covered so large a world with so full a population of living and immortal men and women as Herodotus (no, not even his master, Homer). The work of Herodotus is a prose Iliad and Odyssey in one, rich in episodes and details, and more indisputably one and indivisible than either Epos. Had occasions or fashions served, Greek playwrights might have gone to Herodotus as to an almost inexhaustible mine of plots and subjects for tragedy and comedy. His pathos is profound: his humour infinite. Neither the superstition nor the sophistry of his age affects him so deeply as to distort irremediably the mirror which he holds up to the ages and generations of the world as he knew it. Upon the whole, he is not merely the most delightful but the

[1] Thuc. 1. 21, 22, 97.

most instructive of the Hellenes. The mind reflected in his pages is sane and sage. We moderns are baffled by his art and genius: the results look more like the voices of many peoples than the utterance of one man. We can hardly understand how an early adventurer accomplished so much. We can hardly tell whether the wonderful effects are due to design or to accident. The work is a problem, a store-house of problems, in art as well as in history. It is enough to engage the attention of many students and commentators from many points of view. Each generation looks at it in something of a fresh light, finding new interests in it, and new solutions for its problems. No consideration of it has been final, and none has been complete. Nor is any commentary superfluous, or unserviceable, which succeeds in asserting fresh, or forgotten, aspects of the work as a whole, and in elucidating the character and value of its component parts or elements. In regard to the portion here immediately under view, three problems, or groups of problems, remain to be discussed, albeit their fuller solution may require the exploration of the whole work. There remain for discussion problems concerning the sources from which these Books have been drawn; concerning the evidences afforded by these Books in regard to the author's researches and autopsy; concerning the materials contained in these Books for an estimate of his own conscious mind and methods. With these three groups of problems severally the remainder of this Introduction deals. Only when the two former have been, at least provisionally, described, can we be in a position to complete, provisionally, our estimate of the genius of Herodotus, by including therein his qualities, as critic and philosopher.

§ 20. In regard to the Sources from which Herodotus derived so much of these Books as cannot be matter of his own creation, mere general statements, or a mere abstract classification, cannot be of much service. Here, as with every important problem concerning the composition of the work, it is essential to distinguish between part and part, element and element, story and story, sometimes almost sentence and sentence. The old-fashioned view that the work of Herodotus, as a whole, was the product, or redaction, of oral tradition has been much discredited of late;[1] yet it may be found, on further examination, to be the most prob-

[1] Cp. especially, H. Panofsky, *de Historiae Herodoteae fontibus*, Berlin, 1884.

able and reasonable account to be given of the last three Books.[1] Further, if coupled with the hypothesis that the last three Books, the third volume of the *Histories* as we have them, formed originally a substantive work, or at least were substantially complete, before the previous volumes assumed their present form, that view would go some way towards explaining the semblance of oral tradition, which the work undoubtedly wears in every part. The predominant nature of the sources for the last part of the work, which first engaged the author, has, on this hypothesis, deeply affected the form and character of the work as a whole, and in every part. At the same time it will be generally recognised that the mere occurrence of the *formulae* of oral tradition is far from justifying the inference that the passage in which they occur is based wholly and solely on bare word of mouth. There is an extreme ambiguity in the employment of such *formulae* in Herodotus' diction, as in the usage of our own language at the present day, and the formulae proper in the first instance to the word spoken are freely used of the word written. The word may have been written in order to be read aloud and heard; it remains legible but inaudible, or only potentially audible. A few crucial cases will prove that the *formulae* of the living voice occur in passages not derived by the author from oral tradition:

(1) Herodotus applies the terms of oral tradition to his own work, which is manifestly and explicitly a written work. He 'speaks' —one 'says' it naturally—of his whole work as a λόγος,[2] and of portions of it as λόγοι,[3] and in referring from one part, or passage, in the written work to another, he uses the phraseology of audible speech.[4] He also naturally uses the more precise term applicable to written words,[5] and he uses terms which are ambiguous and indifferent.[6] Thus, although similar phraseology is undoubtedly used of spoken speech,[7] it is obvious that the formulae in them-

---

[1] Cp. § 21 *infra*.

[2] 6. 19 πολλάκις μνήμην ἑτέρωθι τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην.

[3] 5. 22, 36; 6. 39, 134.

[4] 4. 16 πᾶν εἰρήσεται: 4. 53 οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι: 4. 173, 187 λέγω: 181 ὡς καὶ πρότερον εἴρηταί μοι: 4. 187 οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν (*bis*): 5. 4 εἴρηταί μοι: 6. 53; 4. 82 τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς ἤια λέξων λόγον: cp. 5. 62; 5. 65 φράσω: 6. 43 ἐρέω: 6. 53 ἔλεξα: 6. 54 εἰρήσθω: 6. 82 ἔχω εἶπαι.

[5] 4. 195 γράφω: cp. 6. 53.

[6] μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι 4. 16; 6. 19.

[7] Cp. 5. 50 τὸν ἐπίλοιπον λόγον τὸν ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ὥρμητο λέγειν περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ with 4. 16 τῆς δὲ γῆς τῆς πέρι ὅδε ὁ λόγος ὅρμηται λέγεσθαι: 5. 92 Κορίνθιος δὲ Σωκλέης ἔλεξε τάδε, cp. 6. 86; 6. 11 Διονύσιος λέγων τάδε: 6. 35 Μιλτιάδεα δὲ ἀκούσαντα παραυτίκα ἔπεισε ὁ λόγος: 6. 109 ἔλεγε τάδε: 6. 132 οὐ φράσας . . ἀλλὰ φὰς . . λέγων (cp. *contr.* 6. 137).

selves carry little weight in deciding whether material introduced under them has come to Herodotus from a strictly oral source or not.

(2) He cites in terms proper to oral statement, sources, or authorities, which were undoubtedly not living voices, but manuscripts, in prose or verse. Thus Hekataios, the only prose-writer whom he expressly names, is an ἀνὴρ λογοποιός,[1] and in quoting from one of the written works of Hekataios, Herodotus uses most emphatically the phraseology of oral speech.[2] Exactly similar terms are used of the manuscript of the *Arimaspea*, attributed to Aristeas, side by side with references, in the same terms, to genuinely vocal statements.[3] It is therefore obvious that Herodotus not merely applies the terminology of oral speech to his own work and writings, but cites the written works of other writers in similar *formulae*.

(3) The point here asserted is further established by the observation that Herodotus, in referring to documents, which he may or may not have seen, but the existence or contents of which he reports, uses in regard to them language proper to living voices. The oracles found by Kleomenes in the Athenian Akropolis and carried to Sparta are vocal.[4] The tripods at Thebes say their say in incised hexameters,[5] and the inscriptions of Dareios tell their own story.[6] Two notable documents are unfortunately silent, or indifferent, in the pages of Herodotus, the despatch of Dareios to Megabazos, ordaining the transportation of the Paionians,[7] and the 'bible' of Histiaios, which came into the hands of Artaphrenes.[8] Similarly indifferent is the term used of the word or words tattooed on the head of the trusty messenger from Histiaios to Aristagoras[9]; but it will hardly be contended that in any of these cases the language of audible

---

[1] 5. 36, 125 (cp. 2. 143).

[2] 6. 137 τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα, ὅτι Ἑκαταῖος μὲν ὁ Ἡγησάνδρου ἔφησε ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι λέγων ἀδίκως . . ἐκεῖνα μὲν δὴ Ἑκαταῖος ἔλεξε, ταῦτα δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι. Cp. 6. 132, where φράσας, φὰς and λέγων occur within four lines, all applying to a spoken oration.

[3] 4. 13, 16.

[4] 5. 90 οἱ χρησμοὶ λέγοντες.

[5] 5. 60, 61 (cp. *contr.* 5. 77 ἐπιγέγραπται).

[6] 4. 91 γράμματα ἐγγράψας λέγοντα τάδε (cp. *contr.* 4. 88 ἐπιγράψας τάδε). The most striking instance of all is in 1.123-125, where the ἀκούσας is only to be tolerated on the supposition that Kyros had the λέγοντα γράμματα read aloud to him.

[7] 5. 14.

[8] 6. 4.

[9] 5. 35 τὰ δὲ στίγματα ἐσήμαινε . . ἀπόστασιν.

speech, if applied to the written message, would have been surprising, or anomalous, judged by the practice of Herodotus, or even by our own. If, then, in regard to his own written work, in regard to the manuscripts of his predecessors, and in regard to written documents, which he has occasion to cite or mention in the course of his narrative, Herodotus freely uses the language of oral speech, it is obvious that the use and prevalence of such *formulae* in respect to his sources, or authorities throughout, is very far in itself and by itself from proving that he did not employ written authorities to a considerable extent. In short, so freely are the terms λόγος, λέγειν, φασί *et sim.* used of written authorities that, except where Herodotus expressly notifies oral communications, it is difficult to be sure that he is not using a written source in regard to matters which certainly, or probably, had been committed to writing before his time. This conclusion may serve at least as a corrective to exaggerated assumptions in regard to the place of the *vox viva* among Herodotus' sources.

A second corrective to exaggerated views of the extent of Herodotus' oral sources is supplied by a canon, to be expressed as follows: the nominal citation of authorities by Herodotus cannot be taken, without further criticism, as proof that he himself had the statement, or passage, so introduced, from the authorities so named, much less from those authorities *in loco*. It cannot safely be assumed that, when Herodotus names any nation, tribe or corporation as authority for a story, or a statement, he has himself had the matter from the lips of men of that nation, tribe or city, still less that he has visited and conversed with them in their native place. There are several other possibilities, which are not excluded by the methods and standards of Herodotus. As the story, apparently based on oral information, may be derived by Herodotus from a written authority, so the nominal authority for the story may have been taken over by him from his written source.[1] Or again, authorities quoted nominally to him in conversation may reappear in his text at first hand. Even in cases where he may be quoting information given to him by word of mouth, and by the men named in his text, he may

---

[1] Cp. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch* (1890), p. 25 (following Diels), sogar an einzelnen Stellen, an denen die Aegypter als Gewährsmänner genannt sind, ist die Quelle Hekatäos, dem diese Ursprungsangabe mit entnommen wurde.

have encountered his informants elsewhere than in their native places. Thus, for example, when Carthaginians are cited,[1] we are not justified in concluding that Herodotus had been in Carthage, for he might have met Carthaginians elsewhere, in Sicily, in Egypt; nor in concluding that he had conversed with Carthaginians at all, for he might have found the Carthaginians quoted as authorities in a book, or might have heard them so quoted in conversation. Nor is this all: another and less obvious possibility must be contemplated. The nominal citation of an authority may be due to an inference, an act of judgment, on the historian's part. Thus, for example, after narrating the end of Kleomenes, Herodotus records no less than five explanations of the king's awful doom, four of them agreeing in one point, that the end of Kleomenes was a divine judgment for a crime, but differing as to the particular crime for which it had been divinely ordered. The Argives, the Athenians, the Hellenes generally, each had their own theory of the particular crime in question; Herodotus himself differed from all three on this point; the Spartans raised the previous question, and explained the madness and death of the king on purely natural grounds.[2] For his own theory Herodotus is, of course, himself responsible. He had certainly been in Sparta;[3] and the nature of the account in itself makes it probable that he reports the Spartan view at first hand. But how did he arrive at the Athenian, the Argive, the general Hellenic views? It cannot be denied that Herodotus may have questioned Athenians in Athens, Argives in Argos, and Hellenes generally, either in Hellas generally or at Delphi in particular: but neither can it be denied that the report and assignment of the views severally might be, to a greater or less extent, the result of inference on the part of Herodotus himself, or of his informants, or authorities. The actual facts as accredited must, of course, have been first published or made known by Spartans. Once the Spartan statement of fact was accepted, any Greek might infer without much hesitation the view which Athenians, or Argives, or Hellenes would take of its significance: the Athenians would see in the Spartan king's doom the expiation of a crime on Attic soil, the Argives would transfer the motive to

---

[1] 4. 43 *Καρχηδόνιοί εἰσι οἱ λέγοντες*: 195 *λέγουσι Καρχηδόνιοι*: 196 *λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τάδε Καρχηδόνιοι.*

[2] 6. 75, 84.

[3] 3. 55.

Argos, while Hellenes in general would turn with more pious satisfaction to the crime against the common sanctuary. Even if any statements made by the historian were due to inferences, or combinations of his own or of others, they might have some truth in them. In the present instance, however, there are two special reasons for doubting whether the nominal authorities introduced by Herodotus, for the various views reported, would have stood in every case the test of verification on the spot. In the first place, Herodotus is here, to some extent, 'improving the occasion,' having his own particular theory on the subject to ventilate; something is gained for the main issue by the widespread consensus as to the supernatural significance of the event, something is gained for the historian's own hypothesis by the conflict among three other rival hypotheses. In the second place, the story, though necessary in order to bear out the alleged theory of the Argives, is not an Argive but a Spartan story. We are in possession of the Argive version of the war with Kleomenes, and it differs materially from the story in Herodotus.[1] The particular outrage on the grove of Argos is not, indeed, excluded by the Argive story, but the purely Spartan account of the war, given by Herodotus, seems to make it doubly improbable that Herodotus had consulted Argives, whether in Argos or elsewhere, touching this whole matter. Had he done so, he could hardly have remained ignorant of the Argive version of the affair, some points in which are almost necessary to explain inconsequences or obscurities in the Spartan story, which he follows; and ignorance is here the sufficient explanation of their omission. It is not, however, on this or any particular instance alone that the case stands for allowing room for inference, judgment, hypotheses in the nominal citation of authorities by Herodotus. Other considerations supervene. It has been generally allowed that Herodotus was not acquainted with any language but Greek.[2] Though he cites Scythians,[3] Libyans,[4] Persians,[5] Lydians,[6] Carthaginians,[7] and other 'barbarian' authorities, he cannot have conversed with them in their own languages. If he is not quoting

---

[1] Cp. notes to 6. 76-82, and Appendix VII.

[2] Cp. Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen* (1892), pp. 192 ff., for "die entscheidenden Belege."

[3] 4. 5, 8, 79, 103 (αὐτοὶ Ταῦροι), 105, 142, etc.

[4] 4. 173, 187, 191.

[5] 6. 54 (ὡς δὲ ὁ [παρὰ] Περσέων λόγος λέγεται).

[6] 4. 45 (Λυδοί, φάμενοι κτλ.).

[7] *ll. cit. supra.*

interpreters, or written authorities, or barbarians who spoke Greek, or Greeks who named the barbarians cited, he is giving the ultimate source inferentially. How easily such inferences are made, and with what good show of reason, may be demonstrated by our own methods in dealing with the text of Herodotus itself. Herodotus does not always nominate his authorities or sources, immediate or ultimate; but we can generally supply the omission with a greater or less assurance from self-evident or internal indications. Thus the *origines* of the story of the battle of Marathon are not specified; but who can hesitate long to ascribe it to Athenian traditions?[1] The speech put into the mouth of Leotychides might have been heard in Athens, or in Sparta; but is a Delphic source to be regarded as inadmissible?[2] The conjecture of Schweighäuser, which actually introduces *nominatim* the Lakedaimonians instead of the Athenians as authorities in the story of the liberation of Athens, is based upon a consideration of the subject matter and the method of the story itself.[3] It is a legitimate exercise of critical discrimation to assign, upon the evidence of such internal indications, various portions, longer and shorter, in the work of Herodotus to the sources from which he derived the matters in question, immediately or mediately; and this operation he may himself have already practised upon his raw materials. In fine, some room must be allowed, in the nomination of authorities by Herodotus, for the play of inference on his part; although the practical result is not so much to invalidate the evidence of his nominees as to restrict the supposed area of his travels, and the activity of his conversation.[4]

On the other hand, if the dependence upon oral information were to be restricted to the passages wherein it is expressly cited by the historian, or implicitly ascertained, it would be all too much diminished and denied. Herodotus but seldom expressly notices that a statement, anecdote, or story has been imparted to him by word of mouth; and the statements so introduced are not always of much historical importance.[5] For the most

---

[1] Cp. Appendix X.

[2] 6. 86.

[3] 5. 63, note *ad l.*

[4] For further exercises of the historian's own judgment (γνώμη) cp. § 22 *infra.*

[5] 4. 16 ἀκοῇ ἐξικέσθαι geographical information, cp. c. 24. Similar formula in c. 192 (animals of Libya) without ἀκοῇ: 4. 183 ἀκούομεν (swiftness afoot of the Troglodytes) not perhaps quite conclusive. The formula 4. 105 *ad fin.*

part the express signals of this evidence occur in connexion with relatively trivial matter and anecdotes. It is also observable that they occur chiefly in the fourth Book. The geography, ethnography, and anthropology of Herodotus are largely matters of hearsay:[1] historical subjects which fall within his own lifetime, or shortly before, are presumably reported from oral or visual sources; doubtless also a large and indefinite amount of what goes to make up his main narrative is drawn or reinforced from oral tradition, conversation, anecdote, not infrequently heard and gathered in connexion with visible monuments and memorials of the past. But an examination of the actual phraseology of Herodotus throws us back, in the main, for the delimitation of the portions or elements based exclusively on oral testimony, of one kind or another, upon considerations other than the express guarantee of the writer himself.

A similar remark holds in regard to the matters reported on the evidence of the writer's own eyesight. From the nature of the case it could only be geographical and ethnographical facts, and so-called archaeological evidences, which Herodotus might owe to this source. It is again remarkable how little is expressly and explicitly referred thereto. In the three Books here immediately in question there are only three express appeals to the author's own eyesight.[2] There are, besides, half-a-dozen passages at most, in the fourth Book, where the actual phraseology may be taken to imply autopsy on the writer's part.[3] These passages are again comparatively unimportant, and their chief interest lies in the light they throw upon the problems of the writer's life and

---

(esp. the words *ὀμνῦσι δὲ λέγοντες*) looks very like a personal reminiscence; yet it might be based on second-hand authority. Even the term *πυθέσθαι*, which frequently denotes oral evidence (4. 16, 24; 5. 9; 6. 117), and *ἱστορέειν* can hardly be regarded as absolutely unambiguous. 4. 76 *ἤκουσα* (interview with Timnes): *id.* c. 77 *ἤκουσα λόγον ἄλλον ὑπὸ Πελοποννησίων λεγόμενον*: 4. 81 *ἤκουον* (*bis*) the number of the Scyths; 6. 117 *ἤκουσα . . ἐπυθόμην*.

[1] How such evidence filters through is well indicated in 4. 27.

[2] 4. 195 (the pitch-well in Zante); 5. 59-61 (the 'Kadmeian' inscriptions in Thebes); 6. 47 (the mines in Thasos).

[3] *ὁρέων* 4. 36 is, of course, not a case in point. But 4. 58 (the appearance of the entrails in Scythian cattle) suggests autopsy; and the formula *ὃς μὴ εἶδε* in 4. 74 (cannabis), 81 (the krater of Pausanias) suggests a similar experience on the writer's part, as also the words *ὃς μὴ παραπέπλωκε* in c. 99 (Sunion). On the other hand *ἀπέφαινόν μοι ἐς ὄψιν* c. 81 (krater at Exampaios) and *φαίνουσι* c. 82 (the footprint of Herakles) are less conclusive: while the *ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ* c. 124 can only refer to hearsay.

travels. If we are prepared to extend largely, and indefinitely, the range of autopsy as of oral tradition, or intercourse, among the sources from which Herodotus drew his material, it is less on the strength of express phraseology than upon implicit or unconscious indications, and upon what may be called the general probabilities of the case. Thus, although it cannot be admitted that Herodotus visited all the places he describes, and even describes well, or reviewed all the tribes and tribal institutions on which he reports, or saw all the monuments and works of art which he mentions, yet it is quite certain that he had seen such objects in the principal centres of Hellenic life,[1] and morally certain that he had seen a vast number, which he does not happen to mention. The importance of this observation in regard to the *Histories* of Herodotus, and their sources, lies less in establishing the authority of these notices for the service of archaeology than in suggesting that every such monument was a nucleus for oral tradition, and that the effect of temples, tombs, sacred and state buildings, public and private monuments, in preserving indirectly, as well as directly, the records of the past for Herodotus and his contemporaries can hardly be exaggerated. The appeal to these evidences by Herodotus is often direct, though not always critical; but, in estimating the sources from which his information is derived, it is necessary to make large allowance for a mass of tradition, which he acquired by hearsay, in view of such monuments, material objects and evidences.[2]

---

[1] Samos 4. 88, 152; 6. 14. Delos 4. 34, 35. Athens 5. 77, 89 (5. 63; 6. 116); 6. 103. Sparta (3. 55); 6. 61. Thebes 5. 59. Delphi 4. 162. Thasos 6. 47. Byzantion 4. 87. Metapontion 4. 15. Sybaris 5. 45. (Sicily 3. 47?)

[2] Blakesley in his *Introduction* pp. xxv. ff. laid just emphasis upon the importance of temples, and temple-meetings (πανηγύρεις), as sources of myths, traditions, chronicles. Later criticism has pointed out the probable transfer of points, acts, features from cult-practice, or ritual, to the historical record. To such a source has been traced (see A. Mommsen, *Heortologie* p. 211) one of the strangest exaggerations in the story of Marathon (6. 112 δρόμῳ ἐς πολεμίους ἐχρήσαντο); and the same story furnishes in a note the explanation of such transfers (6. 111 ἀπὸ ταύτης σφι τῆς μάχης κτλ.). To matters of ritual and cult may be ascribed not a little in the story of the Atheno-Aiginetan wars, even if the inferences have come to Herodotus ready-made (5. 82-88, 89); from that source may have been borrowed details in the stories of the Minyae (4. 146), and of the Macedonian reception of the Persians (5. 20). To this source has been traced some elements in the story or stories of the Argive war (6. 77, 81, and Plutarch, *Mor.* 245). The extent to which historical events have been commemorated by rites, and ritual in turn has affected historiography, even in this

From the inscribed monument or object to the written authority is but a step, or rather a mere change in terminology, for it is hard to say where the monumental evidence ends and the documentary or manuscript evidence begins. After the comparatively scanty evidences of autopsy and of hearsay expressly recorded, or implicitly afforded, by these Books, the large number of references to literary evidences or documents is the more striking. Even omitting the inscribed offerings or objects,[1] we encounter throughout these Books a mass of references, or citations, explicitly or implicitly based on literary documents, or written authorities. Some of these cases may be more or less problematic: the general result, however, compels the conclusion that the text of Herodotus is to a large and indefinite extent based upon literary sources of one kind or another. It would be a mistake to recognise among these sources only poetical works: and it is important to observe that Herodotus (like Thucydides), while referring only to one prose-writer expressly by name, uses phraseology which assumes a command of all existing Greek literature, whether in verse or in prose. Herodotus will commemorate of the kings of the Dorians what no other writer has recorded.[2] The phrase covers prose-authors as well as poets. A little before he uses terms which imply a control over the whole poetic literature of Hellas.[3]

The incidental references to poetic writers by name bear out the general assumption. Herodotus was not writing a history of Greek literature, but his incidental citations are

---

portion of the work of Herodotus, is probably far from exhausted by the above instances. The following reff. may be serviceable: 4. 7, 33 ff., 95, 105, 180, 189; 5. 1, 12, 22, 47, 57, 61, 66, 67, 83, 88, 92 *η*, 114; 6. 16, 38, 61, 68, 105, 137 f.

[1] Stele of Dareios at Byzantion 4. 87 (at Tearos 91); picture of Mandrokles at Samos 4. 88; inscribed tripods at Thebes 5. 59-61; Athenian Quadriga 5. 77; stele in the Samian agora 6. 14. We now know that the altar of the twelve gods was inscribed 6. 108, cp. Thuc. 6. 54. But besides these, the kraters and other anathemata, tombs, etc. mentioned by Herodotus were probably inscribed (*e.g.* 6. 103).

[2] 6. 55 *τὰ δὲ ἄλλοι οὐ κατελάβοντο τούτων μνήμην ποιήσομαι.* This phrase applies to the particular matter in hand, and cannot be generalised into a maxim for Herodotus' whole work. In the preceding passage 6. 53 *τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' Ἑλλήνων* obviously includes written genealogies.

[3] 6. 52 *Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ ὁμολογέοντες οὐδενὶ ποιητῇ λέγουσι.* The Lakedaimonian *λόγος* which follows is not necessarily a mere oral tradition, nor necessarily derived by Herodotus himself from a Lakedaimonian source. He may have had it from a Logographer.

numerous, and imply a background of further possibilities. Even in these three Books he cites by name Homer,[1] Hesiod,[2] Aristeas,[3] Solon,[4] Alkaios,[5] Simonides,[6] and his reference to Olen[7] may fairly be taken to imply an acquaintance with poems in writing, ascribed to the Lykian seer. The references to Aristeas, Solon, Alkaios, and Simonides are of especial importance here, as they are made in connexion with matters which belong essentially to the scheme and subject matter of these Books. The same remark governs the reference to the Drama of Phrynichos,[8] the loss of which leaves us free to conjecture that there is more in the text of Herodotus due to that work than appears at first sight. The reference to one son of Euphorion[9] would in itself carry an inference to the works of the other, even if Aischylos were not elsewhere named;[10] and Aischylos probably had something to say to the making of the story of Marathon.[11] Herodotus' acquaintance with the poets may on the whole have had more influence on the form, style, and mechanism of his history than on its materials and subjects: but his knowledge of the poetic literature makes it additionally improbable that he was unacquainted with the prose-writers, such as there were; and if his own style was different from theirs, and showed a recurrence to the ideas and principles of literature as a fine art, this very reaction, or advance, in itself implies a knowledge of the actual state of prose-writing, which particular references further confirm. If Herodotus mentions the geographers, the Ionian geographers, mainly to ridicule them,[12] yet it is almost a matter of course that he used their materials and knowledge, wherever it seemed to him sound: even as he accepted the genealogies of the great houses, which were certainly in writing.[13] It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of such writings for the earlier chronology and perspective of Greek history as presented by Herodotus. The loss of the works of Hekataios, and other contemporary writers, deprives us of the one complete and satisfactory method of determining the exact extent of the actual debt of Herodotus

---

[1] 4. 29, 32 (5. 67).
[2] 4. 32.
[3] 4. 13.
[4] 5. 113.
[5] 5. 95.
[6] 5. 102.
[7] 4. 35. The description of Pythagoras as Ἑλλήνων οὐκ ὁ ἀσθενέστατος σοφιστὴς (4. 95) does not necessarily involve the recognition of any writings.
[8] 6. 21.
[9] 6. 114.
[10] 2. 156.
[11] Cp. Appendix X.
[12] 4. 36.
[13] 6. 53 (cp. 7. 204; 8. 131).

to Hekataios and the Logographers: but to deny it altogether, or to reduce it to the bare minimum involved in the explicit or demonstrable references,[1] is unsound and illogical, and would involve, by analogy, the reduction of the oral traditions in the work to the passages where the *formulae* were conclusive, and the limitation of the area of Herodotus' journeys and sightseeing by the express and indubitable evidence of his autopsy and travels.

The written authorities, or documents, employed by Herodotus in the composition of these Books were by no means limited to authors, whether in verse or in prose. The smaller the element recognised as derivable from actual authors the more material remains to be ascribed to other documentary sources. Perhaps the most indubitable class of documents which reappear in the text of Herodotus is to be found in the oracles, whether in verse or in prose, whether Delphic, or from some less august revelation. It is little short of incredible that the isolated oracles, given originally *ex hypothesi* to divers persons at divers times and occasions, and preserved by Herodotus *ipsissimis verbis*, were simply reported to him orally. They were certainly preserved in writing at the centres of inspiration, and probably in copies by the cities, houses, or persons immediately concerned.[2] The question is whether Herodotus took these oracles over from historical works, or from other documentary sources.[3] That collections of oracles existed, other than Delphic oracles, in Herodotus' time is probable, and is supported, out of these Books, by the references to the oracles of Laios[4] and others.[5] That Pythian utterances were less carefully treated seems improbable. In regard to their frequent occurrence in the Herodotean text, there is no necessity for one ruling and one only: in some cases Herodotus may have had recourse in person to the written source, in others he may

---

[1] 6. 137; 5. 36 (cp. 4. 87); 5. 125; 4. 8 (2. 21, 22, 36, 143). Grote did not hesitate to ascribe to Hekataios' authority some elements in the story of the Ionian Revolt (Grote iii. 512). Of his geography Herodotus owed to Hekataios probably more than will ever be ascertained. Cp. further Diels, *Hermes*, xxii., and Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen*, pp. 153 ff.

[2] Cp. 5. 90; 6. 57.

[3] Verse oracles 4. 155, 157, 159; (5. 56); 5. 92 (*ter*); 6. 19, 77, 85. Prose 4. 151, 161, 163, 178; 5. 67, 79, 89; 6. 34, 135 (139). Cp. Schöll, *Philologus*, x. 43 ff. (1855); Schubring, *De Cypselo* (1862), pp. 54 ff.; Benedict, *De oraculis ab Herodoto commemoratis* (1871). F. Studnicza, *Kyrene* (1890), pp. 97 ff., supports Schöll's view that the Battiad oracles are fragments of an epic narrative in oracular form.

[4] 5. 43.

[5] 5. 93 (cp. 7. 6; Bakis, 8. 20, etc.).

have taken over the divine utterance with the human tradition, oral or written. Where the oracles are quoted in prose, where the scriptural verse has been obviously dissolved, there the intervention of a medium becomes additionally probable.

Indications in the text of Herodotus seem to suggest the hypothesis that he, or his authorities, may have had, among documentary sources, copies or abstracts of speeches delivered, or reported to have been delivered, upon certain occasions. Not, indeed, in the speeches inserted as such,[1] which have sometimes very little the appearance of authenticity; but rather in certain stories, which appear to go back to speeches, at least for their raw material. The story of the Ionians on the Danube was told, in some shape or other, at the first trial of Miltiades, as we may infer with all but certainty.[2] Herodotus expressly affirms that the stories of Marathon and of the taking of Lemnos were articles in the defence, on the second trial.[3] It is self-evident that stories used for such purposes were not scrupulously accurate. It is not to be supposed that political or forensic argument, even in the pre-sophistic age, took the child-like form of a string of good stories,[4] and speakers in Herodotus' pages can reason closely upon occasion[5]; but there is no inconsequence in maintaining that Herodotus may have owed materials for his accounts of historic events, directly or indirectly, to such occasions. Important passages in the story of the Spartan war with Argos are directly traceable to the trial and defence of

---

[1] A large part of the Herodotean text is devoted to reporting the words of various speakers on various occasions, in direct or indirect 'oration.' Some of these speeches are short, pithy, laconic sayings, *bon mots*, apophthegms, proverbs, *et sim.* (ἔπη, ῥήματα), of which there is a very large number. There may have been collections of such sayings already in manuscript (cp. 4. 143, 149; 5. 23, 105; 6. 1, 50, 67, 107, 139). In other cases the speeches form a dialogue, conversation, deliberation, of a private or of a public nature (cp. 4. 79, 97 f., 113 ff., 118, 126 f., 134, 136, 137, 139; 5. 17, 23 f., 39 f., 49-51, 106, 108, 111; 6. 9, 11 f., 68 f., 106). It would be rash to suppose that Herodotus had scriptural or even oral authority for every such case. Another class of cases appears somewhat more public and notorious (5. 49, 79 f., 91, 109, 130). Perhaps the class of examples most open to suspicion is that containing the longest set speeches ascribed to individual speakers named, *e.g.* the speech of Sokles, 5. 92; the speech of Leotychides, 6. 86 (cp. the λόγοι cited 6. 43=3. 80 f.). Just for these it is most likely that Herodotus had written authority or materials.

[2] 4. 137 ff., cpd. w. 6. 104.

[3] 6. 136.

[4] As with Sokles 5. 92, or Leotychides 6. 86.

[5] 5. 49, speech of Aristagoras (cp. 5. 97); 6. 109, speech of Miltiades.

Kleomenes, as recorded by Herodotus.[1] A legal process led to the deposition of Demaratos, and the pleadings have probably left their mark on the traditions.[2] To the prosecution of Phrynichos might perhaps be traceable this or that item in the story of the Ionian revolt.[3] The Alkmaionids had supplied occasion for more than one verdict in Athenian history; and it is just possible that the version of the Kylonian sin (ἄγος) given by Herodotus[4] may have formed part of the defence on one or other of these occasions.[5] It is not clear whether the Athenian ambassadors to Artaphrenes, who had 'medized' first of all free Greeks, were actually brought to trial or not[6]; but in any case there were probably speeches in the *Ekklesia* on the subject, though it might be rash to assume that any documentary report of them has reached Herodotus. Acts of the *Ekklesia* at Athens, or of the corresponding bodies in other states, are recorded by Herodotus explicitly, and still more frequently implied, such as alliances, treaties, declarations of war, legislations, and so on; but whether he had written evidence in any of these cases is not obvious. Epigraphic evidence is more probable in such cases than official manuscript, and perhaps the source, so far as present in the text, is present in a diluted form, filtered through the medium of oral tradition or literary authority. The phraseology of Herodotus lends but slender support to the hypothesis of his having employed official documents to any considerable extent. We can hardly suppose him to have used the Royal Parchments,[7] and the Ionian documents referred to by him may have been private documents, nor is there express mention of his using them.[8] He had hardly seen the king's despatch to Megabazos,[9] or the papers of Histiaios.[10] In any case the Persian wars doubtless made great havoc of such evidences in Athens and in Ionia; and in Sparta

---

[1] 6. 82. [2] 6. 65.

[3] 6. 21. [4] 5. 71.

[5] The Alkmaionid stories (6.125-130), which furnish a set-off to the (Philaid) version of the battle of Marathon, have rather the appearance of a poetic origin, and it seems unlikely that such an event as the wedding of Agariste was uncelebrated in literature and song until Herodotus arose to commit the story to writing; certainly the completion of the temple of Apollo had been glorified in literature long before Herodotus told the story (5. 62, cp. Pindar, *Pyth.* 7).

[6] 5. 73 ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν αἰτίας μεγάλας εἶχον.

[7] βασιλικαὶ διφθέραι, Ktesias *apud* Diodor. 2. 32. Cp. Hdt. 5. 58.

[8] *l.c.* [9] 5. 14.

[10] βυβλία, 6. 4. The ἐπιστολὴ of Demaratos, 6. 50, may have been a verbal message.

such documents are less likely to have been accessible or existent. It is not, therefore, to any great extent from such sources that Herodotus records state acts,[1] though here again the direct indications in the text are probably an imperfect measure of the extent to which he had such evidences to employ.

To convert the restrictions above imposed upon the presence and importance of direct oral testimony or tradition, among the sources of these Herodotean Books, into an attack upon the authority and value of the work, would be a strange or perverted exercise of criticism. Here again methodical discrimination is, before all things, necessary. It is no doubt satisfactory to be as near as possible in time and place to the evidence of the senses, to be in direct contact with the eye-witness and the ear-witness. We joyfully detach from the work of Herodotus any and every fragment which is, or may be, derived from the direct evidence of his own senses. But these grains of gold are of necessity, as has been shown,[2] comparatively scanty. In regard to events they are, from the very nature of the subject, almost out of the question. For his historical materials, properly so called, Herodotus was of necessity dependent upon other men. In regard to the main subject of his last volume (Bks. 7, 8, 9), he was able to draw still to a very large extent upon the living voices of contemporaries. For the history of the world previous to Dareios this was less and less possible. The history of the generation contemporary with the reign of Kleomenes (*c.* 519-489 B.C.) in this, as in other respects, occupied an ambiguous position. But in any case, if Herodotus had scriptural evidence for his story, so much the better; for such evidence was nearer to the events. If he was not the first prose-writer to recount the story of the Ionian revolt, but was the first to attempt the reduction of the story of Marathon to writing, the hypothesis might help to explain why the earlier story is, in some respects, the better.

In regard to all those records in these three Books, which carry back the history before the date of the continuous story, the case for literary authorities is proportionately stronger. Other things being equal, the earlier the written evidence or tradition goes back the better. The case may seem, at first sight,

---

[1] *E.g.* at Athens, 5. 77 (ἔδοξε); 5. 97 (ἐψηφίσαντο); 6. 21 (ἐπίταξαν), etc. Sparta 6. 66, 106, etc. Ionia 6. 7 (ἔδοξε), etc.

[2] See § 16 *supra*.

to stand differently, in regard to all matters, for which Herodotus might *ex hypothesi* have had the direct evidence of his own senses. These matters fall, speaking broadly, into two categories: events, and facts of geographical, anthropological, or archaeological interest. For events during his own lifetime Herodotus must rank as a first-class witness, even if his knowledge of them was due as little to immediate observation as to documentary evidence. The other category may seem, at first sight, to stand on a wholly different footing. But even here further discrimination is desirable. Precise archaeological observations may be all the better guaranteed if based upon the writer's own senses[1]; but with the mass of geographical and ethnological materials in these Books the case stands otherwise. There is nothing derogatory to the authority of these records, as preserved by Herodotus, in the supposition that they are based but to a small extent upon his own direct observation, and to a considerable extent upon other authorities. The weight of those authorities is not diminished, but augmented, by the further supposition that Herodotus is not preserving merely travellers' tales, commercial or temple traditions about foreign parts, but popularising, not perhaps altogether without recourse to the arts necessary to make such things acceptable to a wider public, a *Periegesis* of Libya, a *Periplus* of the Pontos, or other works of the great geographers of Miletos.[2] In such works the digested results of generations of travellers and of natural philosophers were probably incorporated: Herodotus' own adventures might supply brilliancy or force to his descriptions, but could hardly have added much to the actual science of the best men of his day in these matters.

It is not within the scope of this *Introduction* to attempt minutely to determine the space filled by one or other of the various sources above enumerated in each chapter of these Books. Further light is incidentally to be shed on such questions by the succeeding sections, which state and discuss the further problems of the composition and contents of the work; and in the *Notes* and *Appendices* the principles here obtained are exhibited in application to the cases of special importance. But to

---

[1] 4. 34, 35, 87; 5. 77; 6. 47, etc.

[2] Cp. H. Berger, *Gesch. d. wissensch. Erdkunde d. Griechen*, i. (1887).

attempt in a tabular form to determine the provenance of each passage or portion of the text would be to transgress all limits of probable agreement. The attempt, where made, is doomed to speedy wreckage, for want of sufficient evidence, of a decisive nature, internal to the text, and for want of external material to furnish comparisons. We are not, indeed, so completely bound to the personal authority of Herodotus as, for example, to the personal authority of Thucydides; for Herodotus does afford copious indications of the sources of his materials: but the indications are not sufficiently precise to supersede the personal authority of the writer, or to enable us to recover his materials throughout in the raw state. From the strictly scientific standpoint nothing less than such a result would be completely satisfactory; but such a result is beyond attainment. It is, however, worth while to carry the elucidation and evaluation of the sources to a point where a general agreement may still be obtainable, without going so far, in the way of speculative analysis and reconstruction, as to challenge opposition or scepticism at every further stage.

§ 21. The problem of the place or places, and date or dates, of the composition of the work is twofold. Questions touching the acquisition of the material in the first instance must be distinguished from questions touching its subsequent, or final, elaboration into the work as we have it. Probability and internal evidences are in favour of the hypothesis that the collection of materials by Herodotus was a work of many years, and conducted in many places.[1] There is also something to be said for the hypothesis that the work in its present form is the result of a final and comparatively late redaction by the author himself, in which literary unity has been imposed upon or infused into traditions, testimonies, evidences, opinions, which were not all originally contemplated as forming parts of one and the same *opus*. If so much be admitted, nothing compels us to assume that

---

[1] Dahlmann's work, *Herodot. Aus seinem Buche sein Leben* (Altona, 1824, Eng. tr. by G. V. Cox, London, 1845), was 'epoch-making' for the study of the question, and is still worth consulting. Rawlinson's first chapter (i.[3] pp. 1-34, 1875), while admitting that "the quantum of travel has indeed been generally exaggerated," still errs in the direction of exaggeration (pp. 8 ff.). Stein, even in his last edition of the work (vol. i.[5] 1883), sends Herodotus forth on *Forschungsreisen in all den Ländern mit deren Beschreibung und Geschichte das Werk sich beschäftigt*. The evidence for such journeys is purely internal; their greater extension depends upon a less critical interpretation.

the various sections, parts, Books, or component parts of Books, came into existence in the order which they now occupy in the work.[1] We are free to argue that larger or smaller parts of the work, as we have it, were in the first instance projected, and to a greater or less extent composed and elaborated, as separable stories, before the author conceived and applied the great idea of fusing all into a continuous and highly artistic unity. Six such well-articulated groups, or systems, of traditions, or histories, can be easily detected in the work, even neglecting the masses of material concerned with, and presumably drawn in the first resort from, local Greek sources: (1) the traditions of the great invasion, as given in Bks. 7, 8, 9; (2) the Egyptian *Logi*, as presented in Bk. 2; (3) the Libyan *Logi*, and (4) the Scythian *Logi*, together forming the fourth Book; (5) the Persian *Logi*, which fill considerable parts of the first and third Books, and seem to supply, and ultimately to suggest, the framework and system for the work as a whole; lastly (6), the Lydian *Logi*, which furnish the bulk of the first part of the first Book.[2] The final redaction or incorporation of these diverse and originally independent materials, in whatever condition of relative finish and completion, is approximately dated by the references to late and contemporary events, which are especially frequent in the second[3] and third triads of Books, and which point conclusively to the opening years of the Peloponnesian war as the time when Herodotus laid the last touches upon his work, though the idea of its complete structure and final form may have been conceived a good while sooner, and even more or less accomplished. A single passage, the con-

---

[1] E. Ammer's attempt, in a tract, *Herodotus Halicarnassensis quo ordine libros suos conscripserit* (1881), to vindicate the final order as the original order of composition, may be taken to show that it is for those who think different portions of the work to have been once themselves separate entities, to prove it; and such proof can hardly be forthcoming. But that L. Cwiklinski, who has thrown so much light upon the problems of the composition of the work of Thucydides, should be found on the other side, in regard to the problems of the composition of the work of Herodotus, is slightly paradoxical. See his review of Bauer (*op. c. infr.*) in *Zeitsch. f. österr. Gym.* 1879.

[2] Cp. A. Bauer, *Die Entstehung des herodotischen Geschichtswerkes* (1878). The unfulfilled promises in regard to the Ἀσσύριοι λόγοι, 1. 184, cp. 1. 106, may fairly be adduced in support of the above hypothesis. The unfulfilled promise in 7. 213 may be regarded as an oversight. Whether Herodotus ever contemplated monographic treatment of the history of any individual Greek state is very doubtful; the monographic appearances in his text can be explained by his 'contagmination' of various sources.

[3] Cp. § 16, pp. lxii ff. *supra*.

cluding words of the third Book,[1] carries the latest revisory and unifying process back over the first volume or triad of Books. That process has indubitably made the secret history of the genesis and creation of the work, which stands before us as an almost perfect whole, difficult, perhaps impossible, to discover. But some theories are more probable or luciferous than others. It is here assumed that the first great section of the work of Herodotus, for which materials were acquired, and to which some degree of finality was given, was the story of the great invasion in Bks. 7, 8, 9,[2] even though, in the present and perfect work, these Books are specially rich in references to the events of the Peloponnesian war. The date of the visit to Egypt may be fixed with approximate certainty to the period between 449-445 B.C., or at least between 454-443 B.C.[3] That would be the date at which the bulk of the matter in the second Book was obtained, and its elaboration might have succeeded before the final revision

---

[1] 3. 160. Cp. Rawlinson *ad l.* (vol. ii.[3] p. 536). In the first three Books there are only some half dozen allusions to events later than 478 B.C. This circumstance may arise in part from the nature of the subject (cp. § 4 *supra*). In the three middle Books there are a dozen or so. In the three last Books about a score.

[2] This view was suggested, as far back as 1854, by Blakesley (see notes 1. 477 to Bk. 7) and endorsed by Rawlinson (iv.[3] p. 1). A. Schöll, *Philologus* x. (1855) pp. 29 ff., also apparently originated it. A. Bauer, *op. cit.*, has enforced it; and the arguments of §§ 4, 5 *supra*, seem to tell in its favour.

[3] Hdt. visited Egypt (1) after 460 B.C., for he mentions the battle of Papremis 3. 12; (2) probably before 438 B.C., for in 2. 148 he mentions, as the greatest buildings of the Greeks, the temples of Ephesos and Samos; the Parthenon was finished in 438 B.C. This point is not conclusive, but accepting the tradition of his settlement at Thurii *circa* 443 B.C., this date may be taken as limit. (3) Hdt. visited Egypt during a period of Persian supremacy, between 460-443 B.C., and therefore not during the period of Athenian supremacy, 460-455 B.C. His visit therefore falls between 455-443 B.C. (4) But from 455-449 B.C. Amyrtaeos maintained himself in the marshes, and fighting was going on; in 449 B.C. Pausiris was established by the Persians in succession to his father, 3. 15. Therefore the visit of Herodotus may be dated between 449-443 B.C. The conclusion thus reached would be voidable on the hypothesis that the notices combined were insertions on the final redaction of the work; but the combination numbered (3) is especially strong evidence, and the conclusion fits in remarkably well with external probabilities. The obvious parody on the opening of Herodotus in Aristoph. *Acharn.* 523-529 (425 B.C.) makes it more likely that this part of Hdt.'s work had been recently published, or was just then notorious, in Athens. Bauer's notion (*Herodot's Biographie*, 1878, pp. 4, 29), that the work of Herodotus was quickly antiquated, is hardly reconcilable with the reference(s) in Aristophanes, the elaborate, though veiled, polemic of Thucydides, the attack of Ktesias, the respect of Aristotle (including the Ἀθην. πολιτεία), and the merits of the work itself.

of the work. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the story of the revenge of Pheretime and some parts at least of the Libyan *Logi* were obtained in Egypt, but internal evidences in the second part of the fourth Book point also strongly to western sources and influences, as will appear below. The Scythian *Logi* have been brought into connexion with the significant expedition of Perikles in 444 B.C.[1] A more plausible suggestion has never been made to account for the visit of Herodotus to Scythia, and his interest in the Scyths. The Persian and the Lydian *Logi* remain. It may seem a violent hypothesis to see in them materials gathered, or adapted, comparatively so late in the day. But there are several considerations which soften the violence. Some amount of material may have been in the hands of Herodotus before he left Halikarnassos for Samos, or Samos for Athens, or Athens for the west. The material in the Books here in question (1-3) is not by any means indubitably drawn from sources accessible only or mainly in Asia: (*a*) there is considerable room for literary sources which Herodotus might have had with him. (*b*) The Lydian *Logi* are saturated with Delphic authority; it is hardly conceivable that Herodotus wrote the first part of the first Book before visiting Delphi. (*c*) Western sources are visible in the first volume, notably in the story of Demokedes;[2] and Kirchhoff, even Kirchhoff, was not strictly accurate when he wrote that in the first three Books (or 1-3. 117) there is no trace of Herodotus' residence and journeys in Magna Graecia and Sicily;[3] but the slight correction necessary only leaves the conclusion of Kirchhoff the more unassailable, viz. that the redaction of these Books was only undertaken when Herodotus' travels were all but concluded. Assuming, as has here been assumed, that the last three Books were the first substantial portion of the work projected, and worked out (subject to the modifications subsequently introduced, on the final incorporation and revision of the whole), the other six Books of Herodotus are virtually a proem

---

[1] Duncker, *Des Perikles Fahrt in den Pontos*, *Abhandlungen* pp. 143 ff., cp. *Geschichte*, ix. pp. 95 ff.

[2] 3. 129-138.

[3] "Von seinem Aufenthalte und seinen Reisen in Unteritalien und Sicilien findet sich in diesen Büchern noch keine Spur," *Entstehungszeit*², p. 7. There are not demonstrable traces in the portion delimited by Kirchhoff, but 1. 23 f., 94, 145, 166 f. may count for something; while if we add the remainder of Bk. 3 the story of Demokedes, as Kirchhoff himself, of course, fully recognises, is almost inconceivable except as a western story. Cp. p. xxxv. *su ra*

to the story of the great invasion, composed out of several more or less independent parts, of which the second Book is the most obvious, while the fourth Book contains two other parts, only one degree less obvious; but, whether any of these parts ever actually existed independently, much more was promulgated before others, are questions which the internal evidence will never decide authoritatively: for Herodotus' object never was to write his own life, or the history of his travels, or of his work; and his final revision of the work has given it such a substantial unity that the decisive traces of its genesis are almost hopelessly obscured. Thus, for example, the reference in the second volume to criticisms on a passage in the first[1] can never be made to prove that the passage in the first volume was written and published before the passage in the second, for two reasons: (1) the passage in the first volume itself replies to such criticisms, and proves that the story told by Herodotus was adversely criticised, and that he defended it, either in the first instance, or in the last revision; (2) even if the passage in Bk. 6 be taken as a reference expressly to the passage in Bk. 3 it would only prove that the second passage was written after the first, and not that the first had been published and circulated previously. To encounter incredulity, it would have been enough for Herodotus to have told the story, or to have read the story aloud, as he might have done at Thurii as well as at Athens. If, however, as is equally possible, the assertion in Bk. 3 is directed against critics, not of the story as told by him, but of the story as found by him, itself perhaps already a more or less notorious story, then the critics to whom he replies in Bk. 6 may be critics not of the story as told by him in Bk. 3 but simply of the story; and against their incredulity the passage in Bk. 3 already contains a protest.

It remains to review certain passages in these Books which point to solutions of the question regarding the time and place, or times and places, in which Herodotus amassed and arranged the materials which form the contents of this his second volume, so to speak. These Books contain, expressly and explicitly, evidence that Herodotus visited Thasos,[2] Kyzikos and Prokonnesos,[3] Thebes,[4]

[1] 6. 43, cp. 3. 80.
[2] 6. 47.
[3] 4. 14.
[4] 5. 59.

Zakynthos,[1] Metapontion.[2] Such fixed points involve many others intermediate. It may here be taken for granted that Herodotus had visited Samos, Delos, Sparta, Delphi, Athens; and the general character of the traditions in these Books fully bears out these assumptions, which are also supported by particular points or phrases in regard to those places.[3] It is not so easy to carry Herodotus in person to Marathon,[4] or to extend his travels in Peloponnese to Sikyon [5] and Argos.[6] It is not easy to make out much of a case for his autopsy in Asia Minor,[7] and only an uncritical use of his terminology can carry him into Bactria,[8] to Ampe,[9] or to Arderikka.[10] If it is to be admitted that he may have been in Kypros, and at Amathus, it is not on the strength of the phrase *μέχρι ἐμεῦ* in the fifth Book.[11]

But in regard to the stories and descriptions in these Books, the main problems, under this head, resolve themselves into the question of the extent of Herodotus' travels in the Pontos, in Libya, and in the west.

The Pontos.—Passages already quoted, just above, guarantee visits to Thasos, the 'Hellespont,'[12] as, *en route*, towns on the Propontis, to which may be added with confidence Byzantion.[13] How far Herodotus' excursions inland into Thrace extended can hardly be made out. No critical reader will cite the inscription of the Tearos,[14] or the description of the Lake-dwellings,[15] as evidence in this connexion; nor argue from the course of the Danube,[16] or the geography or ethnography of the Thracians,[17] that Herodotus had ever penetrated beyond the coast. A casual phrase on Thracian ritual[18] carries a stronger suggestion of autopsy without determining its area. Nor will any critical reader argue from the descriptions and measurements of the Pontos, and adjacent waters,[19] that Herodotus had in person traversed the length and breadth of

---

1 4. 195.

2 4. 15.

3 For reff. see p. lxxxii. *supra*.

4 Cp. Appendix X.

5 5. 67.

6 6. 76. Add Elis (?) 4. 30, 5. 22 (92 δ), 6. 127, etc.

7 5. 100 and note *ad l.*

8 4. 204.

9 6. 20.

10 6. 119.

11 5. 115. As Herodotus had certainly been to Tyre (2. 44) he may very well have been in Kypros.

12 Cp. 4. 95.

13 4. 81, 87.

14 4. 91.

15 5. 16.

16 4. 48-50.

17 4. 89-98; 5. 3-10.

18 4. 33 *οἶδα δὲ αὐτὸς . . τὰς Θρηικίας καὶ τὰς Παιονίδας γυναῖκας κτλ.*: cp. 4. 74 on kannabis.

19 4. 85 f.

the Euxine, or ever set eyes upon the sea of Azof. The heart of the problem is reached when the point arises, whether Herodotus ever gat him farther than Byzantion? There is but one passage in the fourth Book, and not any elsewhere, which is at all difficult to explain on the supposition that Herodotus stayed his voyage at Byzantion. The description of Exampaios, and of the krater there,[1] might seem hardly consistent with candour and honesty, if Herodotus had not at least been as far as Borysthenes (Olbia). The indication of the site of Olbia, or Borysthenes, would suit autopsy, but is not inconsistent with an oral or written source.[2] The supposition that he reached Olbia, however, once granted fits in so well with the character of much of the Scythian *Logi*, especially the parts descriptive of the land, rivers, manners and customs of the people, that it can hardly be resisted. No one, however, will carry Herodotus beyond the Tanais on the strength of the ruins he reports as extant in his own day,[3] much less to the city of Gelonos even though he corrects 'Hellenes' for an error in regard to its inhabitants;[4] albeit the misdescription of the Crimea[5] is not conclusive proof that he never sighted its shores, but proves at most that he did not approach it on the land side. The attempt to construct a map of any country, or district, by simple autopsy is one of the grossest fallacies of inspection that can be perpetrated; but it is more likely to be committed by an actual visitor than by a mere literateur. Neither the description of the Emporion of the Borysthenites as the middle of the Scythian coast[6] nor the references to other natural or artificial objects[7] can prove much; but bearing in mind the obvious principle that Herodotus is

[1] 4. 81. See notes *ad l.*

[2] 4. 53 *πέρην τοῦ ἱροῦ ἐπὶ τῷ Ὑπάνι Βορυσθενεῖται κατοίκηνται.*

[3] 4. 124.

[4] 4. 108 f.

[5] 4. 99.

[6] 4. 17.

[7] The remarks on the blindness of the slaves (c. 2) is very far from implying a visit to Scythia. The remarks on the *Enarees* (c. 67, cp. w. 1. 105) are more to the point. One might almost fancy that Herodotus had heard the Scyths howling in the vapour-bath (c. 75). Herodotus might easily have seen pictorial representations of Scyths with cups at their girdles (c. 10), or have met Scyths elsewhere than in Scythia proper. Those who think Herodotus must have gone to Scythia to see snow (c. 31, cp. 50) may infer from his account of the climate (c. 28) that he spent a whole year in the land. The native pottery (c. 61) has a flavour of autopsy about it; but pottery is portable. Tymnes (c. 76) may have met Hdt. in Olbia or elsewhere. The Kimmerian remains (cc. 11, 12) are no more conclusive than the forts of Dareios (c. 124). The same canon applies to other geographical and ethnographical details.

not writing a book of travels but a work on history and geography, it is reasonable to conclude in this region that the absolutely convincing evidences, if taken alone and interpreted strictly, would lead to an under-estimate of the range of his personal observations, and that a margin should be allowed over and above the bare necessities of the case: though in regard to the breadth of that margin an exact agreement is hardly to be expected.

Libya.—The difficulty of establishing a visit by Herodotus to Kyrene, or any travel in Libya, is very great. The citation of Libyans,[1] of Kyrenaeans,[2] of Carthaginians,[3] certainly does not prove it. The clearest proof that Herodotus had in person conversed with men of Kyrene is supplied by a passage in the second Book,[4] but there is nothing in the passage to suggest that the scene of the interview was Kyrene: the context would rather suggest Egypt. If another passage in the second Book,[5] which has been relied upon to prove a visit to Kyrene,[6] is conclusive, then the passage in the fourth Book, describing the forts on the Oaros, may also be held to prove autopsy, or a passage in the sixth Book [7] to prove a visit to Arderikka and the Eretrians. The comparison between the size of Plataea and Kyrene[8] may suggest that Herodotus had not seen the island, but cannot prove that he had seen the city. The hint of the elevation of the Kyrenaean plateau[9] is suggestive of vision: but the statement might be based on hearsay, as the passage which follows on the eight months' harvest of Kyrene most probably is, unless we are prepared to keep Herodotus nearly a year in the place. The descriptions of Aziris,[10] and of Kinyps,[11] are graphic, but cannot prove more than that Herodotus has lively sources to follow. The localisation of the Silphium cultivation[12] no more proves autopsy than the mention of the weasels which infest it closely resembling those of Tartessos:[13] such creatures Herodotus might have seen without going to Spain

---

[1] 4. 173, 191.

[2] 4. 154.

[3] 4. 43, 195, 196.

[4] 2. 32 τάδε μὲν ἤκουσα ἀνδρῶν Κυρηναίων φαμένων κτλ.

[5] 2. 181 ἡ δὲ Λαδίκη ἀπέδωκε τὴν εὐχὴν τῇ θεῷ· ποιησαμένη γὰρ ἄγαλμα ἀπέπεμψε ἐς Κυρήνην, τὸ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν σόον, ἔξω τετραμμένον τοῦ Κυρηναίων ἄστεος.

[6] Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geography*, i. p. 262.

[7] 6. 119, cp. 4. 204; 6. 20.

[8] 4. 156 λέγεται δὲ ἴση εἶναι ἡ νῆσος τῇ νῦν Κυρηναίων πόλι.

[9] 4. 199.

[10] 4. 157.

[11] 4. 175, 198 (cp. 5. 42).

[12] 4. 169.

[13] 4. 192.

or Libya. If the general account of Kyrene and the adjoining regions is relied upon as furnishing proof that Herodotus visited Kyrene,[1] it must be remembered, on the other hand, that the general account is what Herodotus might most easily have obtained at second hand, and that in some respects the general account is misleading, or distorted. Thus, it is generally admitted,[2] that the description of the Zones applies less accurately to the eastern part of Libya (which would be familiar in Kyrene), than to the western part (which would be known in Carthage, or from Carthaginian sources). It is practically beyond doubt that Herodotus cannot have visited the Oases which he describes with complete confidence, for he makes them hills instead of hollows, and he blunders at the start to a matter of some 400 miles.[3] The account of the *parathalassic* Libyans[4] begins from Egypt; the tribes are not based or centred on Kyrene, as is the case with the Scythian tribes in relation to Olbia. It might from this contrast be argued that for the Libyan ethnography Herodotus is not even following a Kyrenaean source. In regard to the historical portion of the second part of the fourth Book no one will maintain that Herodotus must have gone to Kyrene to acquire any part or elements in it.[5] In regard to the geography, however, a different impression prevails. Even assuming that, for the Libyan geography, Herodotus had no scriptural source—a large assumption—enough allowance has not been made for some other possibilities. A good deal was known of Libya in Thera, in Samos, in Delphi: but still more in Egypt, and not a little, we may conjecture, in Sicily and Magna Graecia. The presence of the Egyptian (Helleno-Egyptian) sources seem specially strong in the account of the coast, in the account of Libyan tribes, between Egypt and the Syrtes, and in the account of the Oases. The presence of the western sources may fairly be suspected in the account of the Zones and in such passages as are ascribed to Carthaginian authority. The story of Dorieus, the adventures of Philip,[6] suggest channels along which information reached Sicily and the West. The southward connexion between the western Greeks and Africa

---

[1] Bunbury, i. 263.
[2] *Ibid.* 275.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 276 ff. Cp. Appendix XII.
[4] 4. 168-180 ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀρξάμενοι.
[5] Cp. p. lxviii. *supra*.
[6] 5. 42-47.

has perhaps not been sufficiently taken into account. The well-ascertained route from Tripoli inland was probably known to Sikeliots.[1] It might even be suspected that the artificial African honey, or sugar,[2] came across to compete with the genuine Hyblaean product in the home-market. The correspondences between the Egyptian and Libyan *Logi*[3] suggest a large community of origin. The obvious evidences in the fourth Book, and throughout the second volume, of Herodotus' migration to the west before the materials of the fourth Book were brought into their present form, give ample room for additions from western sources. In any case, if Herodotus ever set foot in Kyrene, it would probably have been in connexion with his voyage to and from Egypt.

The West.—It is not merely the Libyan *Logi* which betray the influence of western sources, and therefore support the view that the western migration of Herodotus was an important factor in the composition of his work, and in particular of this second volume of his work. His knowledge and opinions of Europe and European matters, outside Hellas, are apparently affected by his visit to the west. The dominant instance is the comparison between Attica and the Iapygian promontory:[4] but it may fairly be considered that the unique reference to Massalia,[5] if not the mention of the Veneti,[6] is attributable to contact with western information. It may also fairly be asked whether the statements and theory of Herodotus respecting the Danube[7] are not coloured by western information, startling as it may be to find the Danube, in his pages, pursuing a course which silently intersects the actual course of the Rhone. It is, however, in the narrative portions of the fifth and sixth Books that the western sources flow most freely. The story of Dorieus,[8] as told by Herodotus, is almost inconceivable except as due in part to local authorities. The same remark applies with equal force to the account of the Samian adventurers at Zankle,[9] and to the note on Dionysios.[10] If

---

[1] 4. 183.

[2] 4. 194.

[3] 4. 159, cp. 2. 161; (4. 165, cp. 3. 91). Add 4. 181, 186, 204 f. The absence of a cross reference from 4. 172 to 2. 32 is no great difficulty. The references to Egypt in the Scythian *Logi* do not prove much, though it is observable that Egypt is cited as better known 4. 47 (conversely the course of the Danube is better known than that of the Nile, 4. 48 f., 2. 33). 4. 42, 43 is a remarkable supplement to 2. 158. Cp. also 4. 39.

[4] 4. 99.

[5] 5. 9.

[6] 5. 9.

[7] 4. 49, cp. 5. 9.

[8] 5. 42-48.

[9] 6. 22, 23.

[10] 6. 17.

the appearance of Smindyrides of Sybaris, with the intercalated note on the acme of Sybaris, and of Damasos son of Amyris the sage of Siris, among the suitors of Agariste,[1] need not be explained as a compliment to the *émigré* historian's new surroundings, yet the citation of the Sybarites who occupied Laos and Skidros, after the destruction of their own city,[2] has an almost unmistakable ring of local knowledge in it. The whole evidence verificatory of Herodotus' acquaintance with western sources at first hand is, of course, not confined to the three Books here considered; and such stories as the tale of Demokedes,[3] or the account of the battle of Himera,[4] supply important evidences in this connexion. But it is the fourth Book, significantly enough, which contains the irrefragable evidence of an actual movement by the historian in person to the west, in the proof of his presence in Zakynthos,[5] and in Metapontion,[6] and in the implicit appeal to a western audience by the introduction of the Iapygian promontory as a natural feature better known than the Attic Sunion.[7] And the distribution of the Italo-Sikeliote influence and materials over all three volumes of his work, points strongly to the conclusion that Herodotus gave the work its final form and unity in the comparative retirement and detachment of his western home. Internal evidences hardly justify the attempt to trace more minutely his movements on Italiote, or on Sikeliote ground.

Whether Herodotus ever revisited Athens, after his traditional settlement at Thurii, there is no clear evidence to show. No other hypothesis, however, so well explains the presence, the presumable insertion, of the numerous references to events in the early years of the Peloponnesian war. The chief bar to the theory—apart from the absence of positive testimony—is raised by the conflict between the testimony of Thucydides and the testimony of Herodotus concerning the shaking of Delos. According to Herodotus there was a unique earthquake there just after the invasion of 490 B.C.[8] According to Thucydides there was a unique earthquake there just before the outbreak of war in 431 B.C.[9] The two statements

---

[1] 6. 127.

[2] 6. 21.

[3] 3. 129 ff., cp. also 3. 115.

[4] 7. 165-167.

[5] 4. 195. The visit to Dodona (2. 52) might belong to the same period.

[6] 4. 15.

[7] 4. 99. The remark on the relative positions of Attica and Lemnos, 6. 139 *ad fin.*, would hardly have been necessary east of Adrias.

[8] 6. 98.

[9] Thuc. 2. 8.

are irreconcilable. The contradiction has to be explained. It seems most improbable that, if there had been an earthquake in 431 B.C. and if Herodotus had been in Athens then, or shortly afterwards, he should not have heard of it; or hearing of it, should have left his statement uncorrected. Even bringing the date of Herodotus' last revision down to 425/4 B.C.—a date so late as to be hardly tolerable—the supposition is inadmissible that an earthquake in 431 B.C. had been thrown back sixty years, and relegated to the region of ancient history to please an interested visitor.[1] The first alternative is to suppose Thucydides in the wrong. If there were two earthquakes, Herodotus has not heard of the one in 431 B.C. Thucydides has, wittingly or unwittingly, denied the other. If there was only one earthquake, Herodotus is in the right, Thucydides in the wrong. How the error in Thucydides is to be explained is another question; but it must be remembered that Thucydides was at work on his history at least twenty-eight years, and possibly thirty years or more, after the alleged earthquake of 431 B.C., and that there is nothing to show at what time he was informed of the earthquake, or inserted the information in his work. Without any insinuation of *mala fides* against Thucydides, it is just conceivable that, before he wrote the passage in question, the earthquake of 490 B.C. had been carried down to do duty in connexion with the Peloponnesian war. That hypothesis is less violent than the alternative that an earthquake in 431 B.C. had been antedated forthwith sixty years. It is to be feared that the vigilance of Thucydides somewhat relaxed when he had to deal with allegations which tended to magnify his own proper subject.[2] No critic is bound to exalt the authority of Thucydides at the expense of Herodotus, least of all on a point where the later historian has an interest adverse to the credit of the earlier. One other conceivability should be faced. Both historians may be in error to this extent, that there had been no earthquake at all, either in 490 B.C. or in 431 B.C. Earthquakes unfortunately cannot be verified like eclipses. An invention at Delos is not impossible. A fiction might be more easily a movable or multiple point. Of all these possibilities

[1] All the more inadmissible as in that very year took place the great Purification and institution of the Penteteris, Thuc. 1. 8, 3. 104, cp. 5. 1. It is remarkable that Thucydides does not connect the Purification with the earthquake.

[2] Thuc. 1. 23, 1-3; 5. 26, 3, 4.

the least probable is surely the transfer to 490 B.C. of an earthquake belonging to 431 B.C. There is therefore nothing in the situation to bar effectively a visit by Herodotus to Athens after 431 B.C. The mention of the Propylaea[1] favours the supposition. Later than 425 B.C. it cannot be brought, even by pressing the evidence.[2] Further speculation were easy but idle.[3]

§ 22. Upon the materials which reached him one way or another, at various times and various places, the mind of Herodotus seems to have exercised a two-fold action, for the one part critical and selective, for the other presentative and creative. A very large part of the text of Herodotus is occupied with the express statement and exposition of his own opinions, views, judgments, while indirectly and inferentially this element is largely reinforced by his methods of historiography. The presence of a large reflective element, as distinguished from strictly descriptive and strictly narrative elements, in the text is, indeed, more obvious than the extent to which the reflective element is to be ascribed to the proper action of the historian's own mind. Certain opinions, judgments and afterthoughts are so closely implicated in the historic matter reported, and are so highly characteristic of popular modes of Greek thought, that they may have come to Herodotus ready-made, in tradition, or in his scriptural sources. Even his own most conscious essays in the philosophy of life and history are hardly original creations, but rather exhibit the precision and application of certain ethical and theologic ideas, constantly present in Greek literature, from Homer and Hesiod to Aischylos and Pindar. But what he found ready to his hand, Herodotus made his own by adoption; and so far as the estimate of the historian's mind, methods, and authority is concerned, the distinction between his own judgment, reason and understanding of the matters recorded in his work, and the

---

[1] 5. 77.

[2] Artaxerxes is not for certain dead in 6. 98 (cp. notes *ad l.*), and the death of Zopyros has been plausibly dated 428 or 427 B.C. (cp. Ktesias, ed. Gilmore, p. 165), so that his desertion to Athens (3. 160) might fall some time earlier.

[3] As, for example, whether Herodotus survived Perikles (cp. 6. 131); whether Herodotus came back to Athens with Gorgias in 427 B.C.—of which there is absolutely no evidence; whether Herodotus died of the plague from which Thucydides recovered, and so on. Once for all, Herodotus did not attempt to write an autobiography, and the independent evidences are scanty, late and untrustworthy (cp. Bauer, *Herodot's Biographie*, 1878).

judgment of others, his contemporaries and predecessors, is mainly important where he obviously records an opinion or theory in order to express his own dissent therefrom; or emphasises the expression of his own opinion in such a way as to imply that it is more or less peculiar and original. It is, indeed, evident that Herodotus was very far from believing everything that he had heard and read. The conflict of evidence and opinion, natural to a multitude and variety of sources, forced upon him a certain degree of criticism, and even an uncontradicted report was not acceptable to him if it conflicted with his general conceptions of probability. It is easily intelligible that critical expressions of dissent, or disbelief, should be most frequent in regard to natural as distinguished from historical facts, or at least in regard to facts involving directly the appeal to natural probability.[1] It is rarely that a purely historical statement is reported and discredited by Herodotus as false or calumnious.[2] In general the historical doubt is exhibited by the conflict of authorities, the exhibition at least implying that Herodotus had not definitely made up his mind in favour of one or other.[3] For the rest, where a statement is given without express comment, or with only so much criticism as is implied in the citation of an authority, it must be taken as the version of facts, or of affairs, adopted by Herodotus, and as the expression, so far, of his own understanding. It is important to observe that Herodotus, though plainly implying the distinction between the credible and the incredible, the probable and the improbable, the uncertain and the certain, does not base the said differences on differences in his sources of information, or on distinctions between observation and inference, inference and testimony. Such differences and

---

[1] 4. 42, the sun on the right hand (*ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστά, ἄλλῳ δὲ δή τεῳ*); 4. 24, existence of goat-footed men; 5. 10, a country full of bees (*οὐκ οἰκότα*); 4. 25, that any human beings sleep six months on end (*τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὴν ἀρχήν*); 4. 5, that the first man in Scythia was a son of Zeus and the daughter of Borysthenes (*ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστά*); 5. 86, that wooden statues fell upon their knees (*ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἄλλῳ δέ τεῳ*); 6. 82, a portent in the Heraion excites his strong suspicion; 4. 96, the existence of an underground chamber is itself an open question, the story is discredited on other grounds; 4. 36, incredulity rises to ridicule.

[2] 6. 121, the responsibility of the Alkmaionids for the shield episode (*θῶμα δέ μοι καὶ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὸν λόγον . . θῶμα ὦν μοι καὶ οὐ προσίεμαι τὴν διαβολήν*). Cp. 4. 77, 105, 155, 195; 5. 10.

[3] 6. 14 *τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως συγγράψαι . . ἀλλήλους γὰρ καταιτιῶνται. λέγονται δὲ κτλ.* Cp. 4. 8, 11 f., 154; 5. 44 f., 57, 85 ff.; 6. 52 ff., 134, 137.

distinctions are implied in his *formulae*, but they are not made the basis of a scale of probabilities. Herodotus has plainly some ideal of knowledge and historic certainty; but the truth, as he conceives it, may be obtained by various ways from various sources in various degrees. Knowledge is not with him different in kind from opinion, and certainty is equally attainable by testimony, by the evidence of his own eyes, by inference and combinations. He knows, by his own inferential conjecture, that Aristeas appeared in Metapontion 240 years after his final disappearance in Kyzikos.[1] He has no knowledge of any man of erudition, except Anacharsis, who has ever arisen among the Scythians.[2] He has an absolute certainty in regard to the Hellenism of the Macedonian royal house,[3] which he offers to demonstrate, and he subsequently fulfils the promise by a transparently pragmatic legend.[4] But he does not always accept a family's history at its own valuation; for he corrects the Gephyraean tradition in the light of his own personal investigations.[5] He has personal knowledge of the employment of wheat by Thracian bacchanals,[6] but whether such knowledge is based upon the evidence of sight,[7] or of hearsay,[8] his *formulae* do not in themselves enable us to determine.

The canon that Herodotus does not, as a rule, draw a hard and fast distinction between hearsay and autopsy, autopsy and inference, avoids the error of arguing, from the standing formula τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν,[9] the presence of anything more than a tradition, or an inference. In some cases, indeed, the phrase occurs in regard to matters which might have come actually under the writer's own observation;[10] but in others such a possibility is excluded by the reference to a particular event in the past.[11] The turn of

---

[1] 4. 15 *τάδε δὲ οἶδα . . ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος . . εὕρισκον.*

[2] 4. 46 *οὔτε ἄνδρα λόγιον οἴδαμεν γενόμενον.*

[3] 5. 22 *αὐτός τε τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος.*

[4] 8. 137 ff. 'subsequently,' *i.e.* in the present order of the work.

[5] 5. 57 *ὡς μὲν αὐτοὶ λέγουσι . . ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω.*

[6] 4. 33 f. *οἶδα δὲ αὐτὸς . . ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταύτας οἶδα ποιεύσας.*

[7] Cp. 4. 31 *ὅστις . . εἶδε, οἶδε τὸ λέγω.*

[8] Cp. 4. 16 *οὐδεὶς οἶδε ἀτρεκέως . . οὐδενὸς γὰρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἰδέναι φαμένου δύναμαι πυθέσθαι.*

[9] This formula is originally but a modest limitation of an otherwise absolute superlative; *πρῶτος*, 4. 42; 6. 112; *μέγιστος*, 4. 46, 48, 152; *μοῦνος*, 4. 148; 5. 119; *ἐπιχολωτάτη*, 4. 58; *ὑγιηρότατοι*, 4. 187.

[10] The Danube, 4. 42; the Scythian grass, 4. 58; Libyan health, 4. 187; absence of proper names, 4. 184.

[11] Circumnavigation of Libya, 4. 42; charge at Marathon, 6. 112.

the formula in itself tends to reduce it to a mere form, implying very little deliberate limitation. When Herodotus wishes to mark the limits of knowledge, whether personal or general, he has more explicit methods.[1] The occurrence of such *formulae*, whether conventional or charged with a personal significance, goes some way towards constituting Herodotus, for us, the father of criticism, as he is the father of history. Such a title, however, cannot be construed into the statement that he was the only, or even the best, critic of his time; in this, as in some other respects, he was probably rather behind than ahead of some contemporaries. It is a happy accident that his work remains to represent much that has perished of better and of worse.

Even larger than the space filled by express statements of disbelief, doubt, or conflicting opinions in the text, is the room assigned to expressions of constructive personal opinion, directly or indirectly at variance with tradition, or with rival hypotheses. Here again, from the nature of the case, the most obvious examples concern natural facts, as distinguished from historic events or occurrences, but examples of inference or theory, in regard to the latter class of facts, are not infrequent. Herodotus has his own theory to account for the absence of floods in the Danube,[2] the relation between climate and inhabitants,[3] the relation between climate and growth,[4] the great superiority of Europe to Asia and Libya in size,[5] and of Europe and Asia to Libya in fertility.[6] Herodotus passes more distinctly into the region of historic theory, or construction, when he expresses an opinion that the Hellenes learnt the art of writing from the Phoenicians,[7] that Egyptian armour was used in the Libyan ritual before Greek,[8] that the Allelu-cry was invented in Libya,[9] that Salmoxis lived long before Pythagoras,[10] that the men of Thera and Kyrene were mistaken in reporting that their founder's name was Battos.[11] Herodotus allows himself some liberty in the ascription of motives

---

[1] *ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*, 4. 197 (cp. 4. 20); *τοσόνδε δὲ ἔτι ἔχω εἰπεῖν*, *ib.*; *οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν*, 4. 187 (*bis*); *οὐκ ἔχω προσωτέρω εἰπεῖν τούτων*, 6. 124; *οὐκ ἔχω συμβαλέσθαι*, 4. 45; *μούνου δὲ τούτου τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ Νείλου οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι τὰς πηγάς, δοκέω δέ, οὐδὲ οὐδεὶς Ἑλλήνων*, 4. 53; *ἐπιστάμενοι τοῦτο εἶναι ἀδύνατον γενέσθαι*, 6. 139.

[2] 4. 50, but cp. notes *ad l.*

[3] 5. 10.

[4] 4. 29.

[5] 4. 42.

[6] 4. 198.

[7] 5. 58.

[8] 4. 180.

[9] 4. 189.

[10] 4. 96.

[11] 4. 155.

for historical acts,[1] or possibilities,[2] but the express motivation of actions or explanations of conduct is so seldom qualified by any formula, that the introduction of a formula rather seems to suggest alternative theories, or accounts of the action. In general Herodotus assigns, or reports, motives for personal conduct without apparent misgiving.[3] Such motivation may have been taken over from his sources, or may be an inference of his own, so obvious, perhaps, as to seem almost self-evident. But the judgments implied are not always indisputable, or even adequate.

The motivation of action in such cases may, or may not, be as historically true as it is psychologically natural. In some cases, indeed, the anecdotal or biographical details present improbabilities or inconsistencies more or less considerable; and it would be too much to say that the action of individuals, when explained by Herodotus, is always explained in a satisfactory or convincing manner. There may not be an absolute contradiction between the motives and objects for the Scythian expedition as stated in the opening of the fourth Book, and the account given in the third;[4] but there is a discrepancy sufficient to justify the hypothesis that the two passages belong to different cycles, or sources, of tradition, or that one of them is a tradition or anecdote, which Herodotus would not forego, while the other is his own more rationalised explanation. The contrast between the incorruptibility of Kleomenes, in his interview with Maiandrios,[5] and

---

[1] 5. 67, 69, motives of Kleisthenes (*δοκέειν ἐμοὶ bis*); 5. 48, the reason given by Hdt. for the hypothetical succession of Dorieus; 5. 118, the course that would have been the best.

[2] 6. 30, Dareios would not have put Histiaios to death (*δοκέειν ἐμοί*).

[3] Hdt. allows himself great liberty in explaining the psychological motivation of actions, *e.g.* in the case of Dareios 4. 1 *ἐπεθύμησε . . ὅτι κτλ.*; 88 *ἡσθεὶς . . ἐδωρήσατο* (cp. cc. 91, 97); 44 *βουλόμενος εἰδέναι* (a purely scientific curiosity!); 5. 11, 12, 24, 105; 6. 30, 48, etc. In the case of Aristagoras, 5. 30, 35, 98, 124. In the case of Histiaios, 4. 137; 5. 11, 23, 35, 106 f.; 6. 1-5, 29. Other persons, Theras, 4. 147; Dorieus, 5. 42; Kleomenes, 5. 74; Pausanias, 5. 32, etc., etc. A *volonté générale* is also similarly accounted for: *e.g.* 5. 77, 78, 79, 81 (*εὐδαιμονίῃ τε μεγάλῃ ἐπαερθέντες κτλ.*); 83 (*ἀγνωμοσύνῃ χρησάμενοι*); 91 (*νόῳ λαβόντες ὡς κτλ.*), etc., etc. From another point of view Hdt.'s motivation may be tabulated differently. Desire for revenge (*τίσις*), 4. 1, 139; 5. 74, 79, 91; 6. 84. Gain, 6. 100 (*ἴδια κέρδεα προσδεκόμενοι*), 132. Ambition, 4. 166; 5. 12, 30, 32, etc. Patriotism, 6. 109; Jealousy, 6. 61, etc. Scorn, 6. 67. Pity, 4. 167 (*κατοικτείρας*); 5. 92 γ (*οἰκτός τις*). Fear, 5. 124; 6. 29. Affection, 4. 146; 5. 49; 6. 21. Gratitude, 5. 91; 6. 30. Ignorance, 5. 19 (*ἅτε νέος τε ἐὼν καὶ κακῶν ἀπαθής*). Curiosity, 4. 44, and so forth.

[4] 4. 1, cp. 3. 134.

[5] 3. 148.

his facility in yielding towards Aristagoras,[1] might be explained by a degeneracy in his character, or by a superiority in the arts of the Milesian adventurer over those of the Samian; but the simpler explanation is found in assigning the anecdotes to different sources, and in detecting the 'pragmatic' character of the second: though it is significant of Herodotus' methods that he should seem wholly unconscious of the difficulty. Of course the madness of Kleomenes would account for almost anything related of him; but the madness itself has still to be proved.[2] The motive for the exile of Theras from Sparta might have been taken from the story of Dorieus, or of Demaratos; but the verisimilitude of the psychological motivation is in this case probably a substitute for historical truth.[3] The contrast between the aged and wise Amyntas and the inexperienced and youthful Alexander[4] adequately accounts for the difference in the action ascribed to them, but cannot guarantee the historic reality of the story of the young men in women's clothes. In short, it is very seldom, if ever, that individual conduct is explained by Herodotus in a way which is unnatural, or psychologically untrue; but it is not seldom that the explanation he gives is unsatisfactory, at least where he is dealing with political characters and with actions of historic importance. The materials for correcting or completing his *rationale* of affairs are not seldom supplied by himself, but they are apparently supplied, to a large extent, unconsciously. Thus, in accounting for the different reception accorded to Aristagoras in Sparta and in Athens, Herodotus betrays an exemplary want of political circumspection; but his own text, in its narrative of events, supplies us with full materials for the correction of the error.[5] His ascription of motives to Kleisthenes the Athenian reformer seems prejudiced and superficial; it requires at least to be translated into more political language before it is rendered acceptable.[6] It is difficult to understand how an author could have written the defence of the Alkmaionidae[7] in oblivion of the

---

[1] 5. 51.

[2] 5. 42 *ἦν τε οὐ φρενήρης ἀκρομανής τε.* The words *ὡς λέγεται* suggest a doubt, which disappears in 6. 75, 84, though the words *ἐόντα καὶ πρότερον ὑπομαργότερον* look rather like an harmonistic suggestion.

[3] 4. 147 *ὁ Θήρας δεινὸν ποιεύμενος κτλ.*: cp. 5. 42, *ὁ Δωριεὺς δεινόν τε ποιεύμενος κτλ.*

[4] 5. 19.

[5] 5. 69, cp. Appendix VII.

[6] 5. 69, cp. § 17 *supra.*

[7] 6. 121, 123, 124.

alliances with Peisistratos,[1] which he elsewhere records, and with Kleisthenes of Sikyon, which he immediately relates.

Thus, a modern critic may fairly be tempted to charge Herodotus himself with a failure of political insight, remarkable in a contemporary of Perikles and Thucydides, to say nothing of the Comedians; and to ascribe the profounder glimpses of policy and political causation, which traverse or illuminate his pages, either to a better source, or group of sources, or to the irresistible logic of facts honestly narrated, and recoverable or replaceable in chronological order. The natural and profound identity of interest between the Mede and the local despotisms in the Greek states could not anywhere be more conspicuously and convincingly displayed than in the pages of Herodotus;[2] but he makes himself doubly responsible for the story—which no apologetic attempts can effectively save—of the proposed institution of democracy in Persia in the year 521 B.C.[3] It is difficult to understand how the author, who penned the praise of democracy in the fifth Book,[4] should have committed himself to the amazingly superficial judgment involved in his comments on the Atheno-Ionian alliance a few pages later;[5] unless we catch echoes, in the one passage, of an Athenian judgment, in the other, of a Laconian jest. The verdict upon the strength and weakness of the Thracian folk (*ἔθνος*) is one of the most pregnant in the pages of Herodotus, and he expressly claims it for his own;[6] and the general cause of migrations is detected amid a medley of fabulous traditions.[7] Two other passages, in which the selfish, yet shrewd, policy of Sparta is placed in an unusually clear light, exhibit a political penetration which goes beyond the normal standard of Herodotus' own rationale of affairs, the account of the proposed restoration of Hippias,[8] and the account of the refusal of the Plataean alliance.[9]

---

[1] 1. 60 f.

[2] 4. 137, cp. 4. 165; 5. 11, 12, 32, 37; 6. 9, 13, 25, 94, 96, 104, 107, etc.

[3] 6. 43.

[4] 5. 78.

[5] 5. 97.

[6] 5. 3 *εἰ δὲ ὑπ' ἑνὸς ἄρχοιτο ἢ φρονέοι κατὰ τὠυτό, ἄμαχόν τ' ἂν εἴη καὶ πολλῷ κράτιστον πάντων ἐθνέων κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμήν.* Did Hdt. intend to insinuate a parallel, a warning? See note *ad l.*

[7] 4. 11.

[8] 5. 91 *τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὥρων αὐξομένους καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἑτοίμους ἐόντας πείθεσθαί σφισι, νόῳ λαβόντες ὡς ἐλεύθερον μὲν ἐὸν τὸ γένος τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἰσόρροπον ἂν τῷ ἑωυτῶν γίνοιτο, κατεχόμενον δὲ ὑπὸ τυραννίδος ἀσθενὲς καὶ πειθαρχέεσθαι ἕτοιμον, κτλ.*

[9] 6. 108 *ταῦτα συνεβούλευον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐ κατὰ τὴν εὐνοίην οὕτω τῶν Πλαταιέων ὡς βουλόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἔχειν πόνους συνεστεῶτας Βοιωτοῖσι.*

These cases suggest an Athenian Machiavelli in the background. In other instances Herodotus seems to have fallen a victim to local sources, concerned to give an explanation, other than political, for political actions. The expulsion of the Peisistratids by the Spartans was due purely to religious piety—as we may suppose Spartans themselves, or philo-Laconians at Athens, to have averred.[1] The Athenian expedition to Paros—for which it is not difficult to find good reasons in policy and strategy—is ascribed by Herodotus, or his sources, to motives of mere personal revenge in the commander, and mere avarice in the citizens.[2] The Eretrians went to Miletos to repay an old benefit—as Eretrians themselves were, perhaps, careful to record.[3] That the friendship of Corinth for Athens was dictated, or affected, by commercial motives, it does not become Herodotus, or his sources, to suggest.[4] This superficiality in the rationale of action is the more remarkable, inasmuch as Herodotus knew well enough that the real and the apparent reasons do not always coincide in political affairs.[5] But this knowledge is but rarely applied by him to the explanation of human action, and upon the whole it is evident that his own conscious explanation of public actions fell far short of the policy and statecraft of the ages which he describes and represents.

The indifference shown by Herodotus, in his rationale of human conduct, whether in peoples or in individuals, for the merely utilitarian motives may be traced, at least in part, to two principles:

i. Herodotus loves a good story, and writes for lovers of good stories, for the many rather than the few: he was a *logograph*, not a sophist, and took Homer rather than Anaxagoras for his master. Science and philosophy are abstract, and eliminate details essential to good story-telling. There may, indeed, be more truth in well-told stories than in half the systems of philosophy, but it is a truth, so to speak, held in solution, and unrelated to other truths. Its charm lies in its indefiniteness: it is not in a teachable form. It gives delight but not instruction. It preserves the memory of men and deeds; but it carries no

---

[1] 5. 63 τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβύτερα ἐποιεῦντο ἢ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

[2] 6. 132, 133.

[3] 5. 99.

[4] 5. 75, 92; 6. 89.

[5] 4. 166 αἰτίην οἱ ἄλλην ἐπενείκας: 4. 167 αὕτη μέν νυν αἰτίη πρόσχημα τοῦ στόλου ἐγίνετο. Cp. 5. 24; 6. 3.

advice, and formulates no maxim. It rests in the simple and immediate intuition that anything and everything which men and women do or suffer is interesting to their fellows. This naïve yet noble sense of humanity was the first instinct of representation for Herodotus, and leaves him for the most part free to take the past at its own valuation.[1]

ii. It is not inconsistent with this observation to admit that the characteristic defects of Herodotus, from the point of view of the scientific or philosophic historian, are also due, in part, to his preference for a particular theory, a certain rationale of events and affairs. Herodotus too often and too easily has recourse to the supernatural for the reason, cause, or explanation of the doings and sufferings of men. Not that the regions of the natural and of the supernatural were divided, or disintegrated, in the time and thought of Herodotus, and of those for whom in the first instance he was writing. But the very indefiniteness of the frontiers between the human and the superhuman, as conceived by Greeks five centuries before Christ, opened the door, on the smallest provocation, to the *deus ex machina*, to the special and direct intervention of the superhuman agent. A comparison between the stories of Herodotus and the stories of Homer, from this point of view, exhibits a difference of degree rather than a difference of kind. In two respects there is a development observable in passing from the *Epos* to the *Logos*: (1) Direct intervention of gods is not, indeed, absent from the pages of Herodotus, even when he is recording events of yesterday;[2] but in general the gods are farther withdrawn,[3] nor does the historian

---

[1] Cp. Hdt. 1. 5, and Thuc. 1. 22. 4.

[2] Pan, 6. 105; Helena, 6. 61; Astrabakos, 6. 69. These are but second class deities. The visions of Epizelos, 6. 117, and Miltiades, 6. 135, are scarcely in point. Aristeas, 4. 15, is not identified by Herodotus with Apollo, and the historian appears to have some doubt as to the epiphany of the god in Metapontion. The apparition of Triton, 4. 179, is ancient history.

[3] Herodotus disbelieves the story of the marriage of Zeus and the daughter of Borysthenes, 4. 5, and even removes Zeus from the pedigree of the Herakleids (τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεόντος, 6. 53), though, so to speak, 'without prejudice.' If he records a flagrant myth, or harmony of myths, in regard to the paternity of Athene (4. 180, cp. 188), it is plainly not that he believes it. His scepticism in regard to the inspiration of Aristeas (φοιβόλαμπτος, 4. 13) may be due to the higher faith: a similar influence may be traced in the practice, almost invariable with him, of making the Pythia, rather than the god, technically responsible for the oracular response. Even the Euhemerism, before Euhemeros, which appears in his pages, is evidence of the tendency to remove the genuine gods farther from the immediate sphere of mortality.

pretend to reveal them in their Olympian or celestial home.[1] Corresponding to this change there is a double development. (*a*) On the one hand what may be called the secondary causes, agencies, or channels of divine revelation and will, play, positively and relatively, a larger part in the narrative.[2] (*b*) On the other hand the unity, the continuity, and the ubiquity of the supernatural agency, are presented under more abstract, less personal and less frankly polytheistic *formulae*.[3]

Though Damia and Auxesia, 5. 82, are still gods in the eyes of Herodotus (*τῶν θεῶν τουτέων* c. 88), he quietly accepts the process which has dethroned Arge and Opis (4. 33-35), Aristeas (4. 15), Adrastos (5. 67); the identification of the Tauric Virgin with Iphigeneia (4. 103) finds less favour in his eyes, and he applies, with considerable misgiving, on his own account the same process to the divinity of Salmoxis (4. 96).

[1] The actual habitation of the gods is a problem upon which Herodotus can scarcely be cross-examined. Sokles turns the world upside down without reference to the question (5. 92 *ad init.*). The symbolical act and prayer of Dareios (5. 105) in no way commits Herodotus. His account of a performance of the Getae (*πρὸς βροντήν τε καὶ ἀστραπὴν τοξεύοντες ἄνω πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀπειλέουσι τῷ θεῷ*, 4. 94) points more clearly to an assumption, and a hint of the same assumption is involved in his report of the disaster to the palace of Skyles (*ἐς ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐνέσκηψε βέλος*, 4. 79). Even if such phrases came to Herodotus, ready made in his sources, his adoption of them would justify inference to his own opinions: but the materials are slight.

[2] *e.g.* Oracles: for reff. see § 20 *supra*. Dreams: of Hipparchos, 5. 56; Hippias, 6. 107; Datis, 6. 118; Agariste, 6. 131. Omens, or Portents: the Delian earthquake, 6. 98; the swarm of bees, 5. 114; the flash in the Heraion, 6. 82; the kneeling statues, 5. 86. Natural events may have divine significance: *σημήια μεγάλα*, 6. 27; the sign of the hospitable man, 6. 35. Mere accident (*τύχη*) may be divine: (4. 9); 5. 92 γ. Cp. 4. 152.

[3] Herodotus was a polytheist. It would, of course, be an *ignoratio elenchi* to cite passages which simply illustrate the common Greek polytheism, without dissent on the historian's part, as such passages might all claim privilege; but certainly the *onus probandi* lies with those who consider Herodotus to have been emancipated from the average theology of his time and folk. In speeches, the polytheistic formulae might be regarded as dramatically appropriate: *e.g. θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων* 6. 11, 109; *θεοῖσί τε καὶ Σκύθῃσι εἰδότες χάριν*, 4. 136; *πρὸς θεῶν τῶν Ἑλληνίων* 5. 49; cp. 92 *ad fin.*, 93. (In 5. 106 a monotheistic formula might have been more appropriate.) In a large number of cases a monotheistic, or 'kathenotheistic' expression occurs, but can nearly always be reduced to a particular denomination: thus *ὁ θεὸς* in 4. 157; 5. 67; 5. 79 (*ἐς θεόν*), 80, plainly means Apollo; in 6. 53 Zeus. In 5. 63 (*τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβύτερα ἐποιεῦντο ἢ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν*), Apollo is almost certainly meant; the reference in the following passages may not be so indisputable: 4. 79 (*ὁ θεὸς ἐνέσκηψε βέλος*), Zeus? 5. 1 (*χρήσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ*) Dionysos? 6. 98 (*τέρας ἔφαινε ὁ θεός*) Apollo? In 6. 27 (*ταῦτα μέν σφι σημήια ὁ θεὸς προέδεξε*) Herodotus comes nearer to a monotheistic formula than anywhere else, perhaps, in these Books. *τὸ ἄδυτον τῆς θεοῦ*, 5. 72, may be taken to imply the deity of Athene; *τὸ τέμενος τῶν θεῶν*, 6. 75, that of Demeter and Persephone; *τὴν θεόν*, 6. 61, that of

If dreams, omens, oracles, and other works of divination[1] play a large part in the narrative of Herodotus, belief in them played a large part in the actual life and action which he depicts. Still we are bound to remember that some of his contemporaries were looking for natural causality, where others saw more or less direct intervention of the superhuman will, or wills; and that Herodotus in his attitude on this matter represents rather the popular than the critical spirit of his age. This reaction, or survival, in his mind seems to leave him satisfied with the more edifying version of many events and acts where a more scientific one might have been forthcoming, or to lead him even to prefer a story, or a version of affairs, which introduces the miraculous or supernormal element, even if it be in the humble form of an undesigned coincidence.[2] If from one point of view the result presents to us a more lively and instructive picture of the mind and morale of Hellas in the historian's own day, still, on the

---

Helene; *ἱρὸν ἐπιχωρίης θεοῦ* Κυβήβης, 5. 102, that of the goddess named: and even if such passages were written 'without prejudice,' what could be said of 6. 91? Speeches, again, may be dramatic (cp. 4. 119, *ὅσον χρόνον ὁ θεὸς παρεδίδου . . ἐπεὶ σφεας ὡυτὸς θεὸς ἐγείρει κτλ.* 6. 86 *ἡ δὲ* Πυθίη *ἔφη τὸ πειρηθῆναι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι ἴσον δύνασθαι.* Cp. 6. 35, 82, 98, 80); but Herodotus, speaking *propria persona*, lays down the rule of moderate vengeance *πρὸς θεῶν*, 4. 205, and seems to pass a censure on the monotheistic Getae, *οὐδένα ἄλλον θεὸν νομίζοντες εἶναι εἰ μὴ τὸν σφέτερον*, 4. 94. Moreover, such a passage as the correlative lists of Greek and Scythian divinities, 4. 59, goes far to commit Herodotus to the current polytheism of his age. Whether he endorsed the 'Scythic' criticism on a detail of Hellenic religion, 4. 79, does not appear: nor can we determine the relations in which he conceived various deities, or divine personifications of one and the same deity, to have stood to one another (cp. 4. 181, 203; 5. 46, 105, 119; 6. 53, 56, etc.): nor is there much evidence, in these Books, of any effort on the part of Herodotus to carry on the theologic process which he ascribes to Homer and Hesiod, 2. 53. On the other hand, signs are not wanting that the tendency towards a more abstract and monistic conception of supernatural actions and providences had affected the sources, and the mind, of the historian: to this tendency may be traced the fatalistic formula *δέειν et sim.*, 4. 79; 5. 33, 92 γ; 6. 64, 135; the divinisation of Chance, 4. 8, etc.; the divine *μοῖρα*, 4. 164; the fatal *μισθός*, 4. 166; the appointed days, 5. 93, cp. 6. 86—for, though such *formulae* are easily reconcilable with theism or with polytheism, they still tend towards the elimination of caprice, free-will, and special interventions. The same remark holds good of any philosophy of history, however crude: see further, the text above following (2).

[1] The apparition of Melissa 5. 92 η; the madness of Kleomenes, 6. 84; the panic of the Persians, 4. 203; the fright of Miltiades, 6. 134.

[2] 6. 116, to this class might also be referred the curious or ironical fulfilments of prophecy: 5. 72; 6. 80, 139 f.

whole, it can hardly be contended that the professed history recorded by Herodotus has not suffered by the *idola fori*, which intrude upon it at every turn. The result may be all equally historical to us; but the history is not exactly the history as the writer himself conceived it.

(2) The above argument is not substantially modified when we turn from the particular and secondary manifestations of the divine purpose, and causality, to the metaphysical and ethical design underlying or pervading the world of human history, as conceived by Herodotus. To Herodotus human history as a whole, and in its parts, is a fable, or book of fables, with one moral, verifiable in the fortunes of the State, revealed in the cases of the Family and the Man. Human life to Herodotus is a sphere for the realisation of Divine Judgments. The rise and fall of communities, the fates of individuals alike proclaim themselves manifestations of an overruling interference and providence. The judgments are not, indeed, mysterious, but intelligible. Explaining, rather than paraphrasing, the thought of Herodotus, one might say that the judgment is human, the power which fulfils it is divine. Doubtless this view of human affairs tends at times to trivialities. It becomes a substitute for hard thinking. It furnishes an easy exit to every moral problem. It does duty instead of an investigation into the actual circumstances of an obscure case. It encourages ethical and devout intuition as a substitute for the discovery of intrigue and policy, the lower and higher springs of human action. It eliminates accident; it tends to eliminate pity and pathos. Though it begins in poetry, it ends in the flattest commonplaces. But it has one great merit—it appeals to the wide public, not to this or that school or clique; it preserves, to a wonderful extent, facts which are significant, and leaves the philosopher or critic to place his own interpretations upon the facts which have been preserved by their very apotheosis. Herodotus was not, of course, in any sense the inventor of that philosophy of life which meets us in his pages. On one side the doctrine of divine feeling and judgment and their exhibition in human history is but the application of the common Greek standards of character and conduct to the fortunes of states and nations, of great persons and families. The principles of the divine justice are but the maxims of popular ethics writ large,

and applied on a large scale. In literature this application had a long history before the time of Herodotus, beginning at least with the Homeric poems, and passing, through lyric and tragic poetry, to the creators of prose literature. If originality is to be claimed for Herodotus in this connexion, it must be sought rather in his application of the doctrine to the fortunes of nations, and in the enlargement of the sphere and operation of this poetic justice by its introduction as a principle of artistic creation into logography. It here especially concerns us to observe the variety of the *formulae* employed by Herodotus for its expression, and their incidence in the fourth, fifth and sixth Books. Four principal terms, with their cognates, occur for the expression of the doctrine, as verifiable in history: *φθόνος, νέμεσις, τίσις, δίκη.* A consideration of these terms, and an examination of their employment, can leave little room for doubt that the first is the most emphatically anthropopathetic,[1] and the last the most purely moral and objective,[2] while the second inclines to the region of human feeling,[3] and the third to the greater austerity of the purely moral judgment.[4] It is also clear that in the usage of

---

[1] Cp. the reason given for the 'promiscuity' among the Agathyrsi: *ἵνα κασίγνητοί τε ἀλλήλων ἔωσι καὶ οἰκήιοι ἐόντες πάντες μήτε φθόνῳ μήτε ἔχθεϊ χρέωνται ἐς ἀλλήλους*, 4. 104. Add, *φθόνον τε καὶ ἵμερον τῆς γῆς*, quoting Hekataios, 6. 137; *φθόνῳ καὶ ἄγῃ χρεώμενος*, 6. 61. In *χρυσὸς ἄφθονος*, 6. 132, the compound has lost its primary force. The only passage in these Books where the term is predicated of the divine beings is 4. 205, but the doctrine underlies the prejudice against the *εὐδαιμονία* of Naxos and Miletos, 5. 28, and other passages.

[2] The absence of *δίκη* marks a savage lawless condition: *Ἀνδροφάγοι δὲ ἀγριώτατα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἔχουσι ἤθεα, οὔτε δίκην νομίζοντες οὔτε νόμῳ οὐδενὶ χρεώμενοι*, 4. 106. Justice demands the avoidance of aggression by states as by individuals (*ὕπηρξαν ἀδικίης*, 4. 1; cp. 119), the respect for contracts, 5. 84, cp. 4. 196, scrupulous honesty, 6. 86, and in general respect for the rights of persons, family, property, and so on; cp. 4. 114; 5. 92 (the injustice of tyranny, cp. 6. 127, Pheidon): and as the truly just man is blessed (Skythes, 6. 24, *δικαιότατον . . γῆραϊ μέγα ὄλβιος ἐὼν ἐτελεύτησε*), so the unjust man is surely punished (6. 86, Glaukos). To be punished or to make atonement for wrong-doing is the law of this world (*τῶν πρότερον ἀδικημάτων δοῦναι δίκας*, 6. 87), and has the highest sanction (*ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφέας ἐκέλευε Ἀθηναίοισι δίκας διδόναι*, 6. 139), and well is them that recognise this law (cp. 6. 92). The corruption of human justice (*δίκην ἄδικον δικάζειν*, 5. 25) is deservedly punished with condign severity.

[3] The term *νέμεσις* does not occur in these Books as it happens; though we are within measurable distance of that idea in the myth of Adrastos, 5. 97, see notes *ad l.*, and perhaps not far off, in the *ὅρκου πάις ἀνώνυμος* of the 'oracle' put into the mouth of Leotychides, 6. 86.

[4] The term *τίσις* and its cognates might appear in some respects the most purely objective, supplying, as they do, a formula for the *lex talionis* as a fact,

Herodotus the first two terms are more distinctly religious, the last two more ethical. It can hardly be a mere accident that in the three Books here in question the formula of *φθόνος*, *νέμεσις*, almost disappear, giving way to the more abstract and colder formula of *τίσις* and *δίκη*, or even to the indifference of a purely fatalistic principle.[1] It may be that the change is due, at least in part, to a difference in the date and mood in which Herodotus compiled this portion of his work. Without endorsing the theory that his visit to Egypt produced any sceptical development, or tendency, in his mind,[2] it is still possible to argue that the various portions of the work of Herodotus were not all composed in the same vein, and that in the course of thirty years or so his mind underwent some development and readjustment in the light of his ever-growing experience. But anything like a radical change or conversion in the mind of Herodotus cannot be discovered in his work. In any case he left all the passages, in which the lower anthropopathetic and least defensible descriptions of the divine nature are to be found, standing in the last and mature revision of the whole work; and the elements for a sceptical education were much more efficient in the philosophic schools of Ionia, or of Magna Graecia, than in the temples of Egypt. Nor could it be mere chronological differences in the subject that account for the differences in the *formulae*, which express the judgment of Herodotus on the course of affairs; for in regard to the most recent section of events, the invasion of Xerxes, the doctrine of the divine *φθόνος* is formulated not less explicitly than in regard to the more remote. Something plainly depends upon the scale of action, the elements of contrast; and if Artabanos applies for the benefit of Xerxes[3] the same

without the intervention of the act of judgment implied by *δίκη*. But such an appearance is illusory. For, in the first place, *τίσις*, *τίσασθαι*, *et sim.* are more nearly related to human feeling than *δίκη*, and, secondly, the *τίσις* only becomes part of the divine order when it is related to *δίκη* and the judgment therein contained. The following reff. will show that a real *τίσις* implies a real, or supposed, *ἀδίκημα*, *ἀδικία*, as antecedent, 4. 1, 118, 139; 5. 77, 79, 91, 105; 6. 72, 75, 84, 87, 92, 101 (cp. 5. 102). The most perfect expression of the law is found in the divine verse 5. 56, *οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἀδικῶν τίσιν οὐκ ἀποτίσει.* It may be added that the term *ὕβρις*, or an equivalent, is not infrequently found to express, or explain, the wrong, 4. 146, 159; 5. 74; 6. 87, 127, 137, cp. 4. 93 f.; 5. 83; 6. 92; 6. 10, etc.

[1] *δέειν et sim.* Cp. note 3, p. cxi. *supra.*

[2] A suggestion of A. Bauer's, *Die Entstehung, etc.*, p. 47 ff.

[3] 7. 10 ε, 46.

doctrine, in almost the same words, which is put into Solon's mouth for the benefit of Kroisos,[1] one reason may be that Kroisos and Xerxes supplied the two greatest and most thrilling examples within Greek memory to illustrate this strain of Greek thought. Something also may turn upon the state and condition of the sources available for Herodotus. The story of Xerxes, the story of Kroisos, as surely as the story of Periandros or the story of Glaukos, had been ethicised and pragmatised before Herodotus undertook to narrate them. The story of Marathon was still in the making, and more a matter of private interpretation; the supernatural ornaments were not wanting to it;[2] but the Athenian sources followed by Herodotus, pragmatic though they were, could not wholly obliterate the historic significance or even the immediate causality of that victory.[3] The story of the Ionian revolt is curiously free from the supernatural deposit, whether as a constituent, or as a reflective, element.[4] The lesson of the story as told by Herodotus is an almost purely political and historical lesson. So far as his sources were not affected by later political interests, they seem to go back to authentic and contemporary testimony of one kind or another. That the historical element is not always in inverse proportion to the amount of supernaturalism in a story is proved by the case of the Scythian campaign, where the element of fiction is patent and preponderant, and the supernaturalism is conspicuous only by its absence. The story as a whole may have been calculated to exhibit a case of human pride and ambition foiled and punished by divine will;[5] but the lesson is not explicitly enforced, and the story is largely an illustration of military, rather than of ethical,

---

[1] 1. 32.

[2] It is observable that Hdt. is very far from restricting the significance of the Delian earthquake to the campaign which, according to him, it immediately preceded, 6. 98. The epiphany of Pan, 6. 105, the dream of Hippias, c. 107, the vision of Epizelos, c. 117, the dream of Datis, c. 118, the coincidence, cc. 108, 116, exhaust the marvels of Marathon in the Herodotean record. But the miraculous element is still far larger than in the stories of the Scythian campaign and Ionian revolt.

[3] See further on this subject, Appendix X.

[4] *οὐ γὰρ ἔδεε κτλ.* 5. 33. The burning of the temple, 5. 102, the prayer of Dareios, 5. 105, the oath of Histiaios, 5. 106, can hardly be reckoned. But 5. 114; 6. 16, 27, are more to the point.

[5] 4. 83; 7. 10, 18. In the last passage it ranks with the disastrous expeditions of Kyros against the Massagetae and of Kambyses against the Aithiopes.

maxims. Stories of Mardonios,[1] of Dorieus,[2] of Kleomenes,[3] of Miltiades[4] had all been ethicised and pietised, that is rationalised, in terms acceptable to the feelings of good Hellenes, before they reached Herodotus. How much his own art or piety added in such cases it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to determine. In the case of Kleomenes, the actual variant of the historian himself involves but a distinction without a difference.[5] The story of Glaukos[6] likewise points to the source of such implicit morals; for it cannot be supposed that Herodotus simply invented that story. Neither in these, nor in other cases, have we the means of determining the exact limits of Herodotus' creative energy as an author. His style is his own,[7] as much as any word, thought, language or method can ever be the proper and sole work of one individual mind. His materials are all but invariably worked up into the forms and phrases of his own style;[8] it is very rarely that he presents his materials raw, or just as he obtained them.[9] The speeches, as they stand in his work, can hardly be authentic, however much of traditional matter they may directly, or indirectly, preserve. It is not likely that any story or anecdote, as a rule, loses in the telling, as Herodotus tells it; but that he deliberately fabricated anecdote, legend or narrative is an hypothesis beyond proof. All but the greatest achievement of his art is the work as a whole, the wholeness of the work. But this wholeness can best

---

[1] 6. 43-45.

[2] 5. 42-45. It was the men of Sybaris who reasoned: *εἰ δὴ μὴ παρέπρηξε μηδὲν κτλ.*, that is, who argued that the fate of Dorieus was a divine judgment. But Hdt. only differs by exaggerating the alternative, c. 48.

[3] 6. 75, 84.

[4] 6. 135 makes the Pythia responsible for the moral.

[5] *l.c. ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκέει τίσιν ταύτην ὁ Κλεομένης Δημαρήτῳ ἐκτῖσαι.*

[6] 6. 86.

[7] We have, indeed, practically almost nothing of the Logographs with which to compare it; but the verdict of antiquity comes in; cp. Dionys. Halikarnass. *De imitatione* 3 (ed. Usener, 1889, pp. 22 f.), *Ep. ad Pomp.* 3 (Usener, pp. 49 ff.), Hermogenes, *De gen. dicendi*, 2. 12 (ed. Spengel, ii. p. 421). The conscious and deliberate contrast of style presented by Thucydides might suggest an analogous relation between Herodotus and Hekataios, who was by no means devoid of style; cp. Hermogenes, *op. cit.* (Spengel, ii. pp. 423 ff.). Herodotus' 'first style' (cp. Schöll, *Philologus*, x. p. 76), or other styles, may be sufficiently accounted for by the varieties of his subjects and sources. Cp. § 20 *supra*, and p. lxvii.

[8] But cp. notes to 4. 13; 5. 36; 6. 137.

[9] Express quotations, of course, excepted. The poetical source sometimes shimmers through the prose; cp. 4. 163; 5. 92; 6. 126. The official document sometimes shows through the more artful texture; cp. 5. 52; 6. 53.

be understood when the work is regarded as a result of growth, revision, reflection and time, almost a lifetime: not a product, conceived as it stands, and worked out, at one time and one place, in accordance with that single preconception. The summit of the writer's art is to have all but completely obliterated the evidences of that process by which his work reached its relative perfection, rendering any and every hypothesis on the subject apparently beyond the conditions of absolute verification. So far as reasonable hypotheses go, they are to be reached almost solely by a simple yet searching analysis of the work into its constituent parts and elements, and a critical observation of the general and special qualities and characters of the materials, or elements, out of which the work, as a whole, has been created. In the present edition that method is exhibited in application to a good third of the work, in accordance with the initial principle of division expounded above.[1] That the exhibition is complete, or exhaustive, is not here insinuated; nor is it to be denied that its results, in regard to any given portion of the work, must depend, in the final resort, on its application to the work from beginning to end.

---

[1] §§ 1 ff.

THE TEXT

The Greek Text printed in this edition is taken, not without corrections, from Stein's smaller edition, *Herodoti Historiae. Ad recensionem suam recognovit Henricus Stein. Berolini, apud Weidmannos. A. MDCCCLXXXIV.* That edition presents a more conservative result than would be generally acceptable now-a-days, or than Stein himself, perhaps, would now endorse, as appears from the later issues of his annotated edition of Bks. 7 (1889), 8, 9 (1893). That result, however, represents an average of the codices, as good, perhaps, as any other, and therefore, apart from certain practical advantages, lends itself conveniently to the purposes of the historical commentator. In the Notes, however, some space has inevitably been devoted to various readings, emendations and conjectures, and a few contributions to the ideal text have been attempted. The textual criticism of Herodotus has, indeed, for some time past been largely and justifiably exercised in conjectural emendation. The condition and classification of the MSS. appear to have been fairly well ascertained, and the statement of the case, as given by Stein in his larger edition (1869), still, in the main, holds the field. Of some six and forty codices Stein rejected five and thirty, as critically useless ; of the eleven remaining codices he took five, as the basis of his text, using the others as subsidiary or illustrative. Having regard merely to the actually extant and best MSS. it is generally agreed that they are ultimately derived from two main types: I. A text represented by the three oldest MSS., the Medicean, *Mediceus* (A) *saec. X.*, a Roman, *Passioneus* (B) *saec. XI.*, and a Florentine, *Florentinus*, or *Laurentianus* (C) *saeculi, ut videtur, XI.*, now, like A, in the Laurentian Library. II. A text represented by a Roman, *Vaticanus* (R) *saec. XIV.*, a Parisian, *Parisinus* (P) *saec., ut videtur, XIII.*, a Viennese, *Vindobonensis* (V), and the Sancroft MS. in Emmanuel College, Cambridge (S, or *s*), this last having a special interest for English scholars, as its collation formed the characteristic of Gaisford's text. These two main types are indicated in A. Holder's edition by the symbols α (= A + B), and β (= R + V + S), which symbols have been occasionally employed in the following Notes. Speaking broadly, Stein's texts incline in favour of the first class, α, and especially of A, while the tendency of later editors has been to increase the authority of the second, β, and especially of R. (See C. G. Cobet, *Mnemosyne*, 1882, pp. 400 ff., M. Wehrmann, *de Herodotei codicis Romani auctoritate.* Halle, 1882.) The whole of the fifth Book, however, happens to be wanting in this Roman MS. It would be rash to assert that the last word has been said upon the authority of the existing codices ; but, meanwhile, criticism has been busy, on the strength of the approximate agree-

ment above indicated, in restoring the original text, not merely upon the basis of the MSS. readings, but by the aid of copious conjecture. There are three directions in which this work has been carried on: first, towards the removal of glosses and interpolations, mostly short; the only long passage, in the books here immediately under consideration, open to grave suspicion being 6. 122, a chapter actually omitted in *a* (ABC). Secondly, in the direction of marking, and supplying *lacunae*, a class of corruptions which editors are tending to enlarge more and more. In the third place, an effort is being made to purify and restore the true Herodotean dialect, not alone from the literary sources, but also from epigraphic evidences. Whether this last device can result in a genuine restoration of the Archetype, from which *ex hypothesi* all existing MSS. are descended, much more in the sure restoration of genuinely Herodotean forms, are problems involving some previous questions, as, for example, the relation of the dialect of inscriptions in evidence to the literary forms adopted by Herodotus, which cannot here be pursued. Remarks upon the constitution of the text have been introduced in the Notes following, mainly where they seemed to be demanded by material or historical considerations. It is assumed that every student of the text, as such, will have at his command the larger edition of Stein (*Herodoti Historiae. Recensuit Henricus Stein.* Berlin, 1869), exhibiting the *testimonia* as well as the MSS. readings, together with the indispensable edition of Holder (*Herodoti Historiae recensuit Alfred Holder.* Leipzig, 1886, 1888), the *apparatus criticus* of which includes the principal emendations up to date; and it were well not to overlook the strictly castigated edition of van Herwerden (ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΙ *recognovit Henricus van Herwerden*, 4 vols. Utrecht, N. D.), which, though designed, perhaps like the archetype of class *β* above described, *in usum scholarum*, is a monument of critical courage, not less acceptable to the historical student than exemplary to the textual reformer. Cobet's recension of the text of the three Books here in question is to be found in *Mnemosyne*, 1884, pp. 77 ff., 129 ff. The *Index Lectionum*, at the end of volume II., exhibits the critical apparatus of this edition in a continuous form.

ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ

ΜΕΛΠΟΜΕΝΗ

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Βαβυλῶνος αἵρεσιν ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Σκύθας αὐτοῦ Δαρείου ἔλασις. ἀνθεύσης γὰρ τῆς Ἀσίης ἀνδράσι καὶ χρημάτων μεγάλων συνιόντων, ἐπεθύμησε ὁ Δαρεῖος τίσασθαι Σκύθας, ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι πρότεροι ἐσβαλόντες ἐς τὴν Μηδικὴν καὶ νικήσαντες μάχῃ τοὺς ἀντιουμένους ὑπῆρξαν ἀδικίης. τῆς γὰρ ἄνω Ἀσίης ἦρξαν, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται, Σκύθαι ἔτεα δυῶν δέοντα τριήκοντα. Κιμμερίους γὰρ ἐπιδιώκοντες ἐσέβαλον ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, καταπαύσαντες τῆς ἀρχῆς Μήδους· οὗτοι γὰρ πρὶν ἢ Σκύθας ἀπικέσθαι ἦρχον τῆς Ἀσίης. τοὺς δὲ Σκύθας ἀποδημήσαντας ὀκτὼ καὶ εἴκοσι ἔτεα καὶ διὰ χρόνου τοσούτου κατιόντας ἐς τὴν σφετέρην ἐξεδέξατο οὐκ ἐλάσσων πόνος τοῦ Μηδικοῦ· εὗρον γὰρ ἀντιουμένην σφίσι στρατιὴν οὐκ ὀλίγην. αἱ γὰρ τῶν Σκυθέων γυναῖκες, ὥς σφι οἱ ἄνδρες ἀπῆσαν χρόνον 1

---

1. 1. **μετὰ κτλ.** For the Chronology, see Appendix III.

ἐπὶ Σκύθας αὐτοῦ Δαρείου ἔλασις. Of the king *in person*, as of Kambyses against Egypt (3. 1), and against the Aithiopians (3. 25), or Xerxes against Hellas. Compare 7. 10 *θ*; 7. 20; cp. Isokrates 4. 88 *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα γενομένης τῆς ὕστερον στρατείας, ἣν αὐτὸς Ξέρξης ἤγαγεν κ.τ.λ.* *αὐτοῦ*, which is the reading of the codices, is preferable to *αὖ τοῦ* (Schweig. and Blakesley), or to *αὐτίκα*, suggested by Stein, or the bald *τοῦ* (Cobet). Cp. *αὐτὸς Δαρεῖος* 5. 32, and c. 83 *infra*. Introduction, § 12, p. xxviii.

2. **ἔλασις**, 7. 37.

ἀνθεύσης . . Ἀσίης. On the motives and object of the Scythian Expedition, see Appendix III.

ἀνδράσι. But compare 7. 210 . . *πολλοὶ μὲν ἄνθρωποι εἶεν, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἄνδρες.* Here *ἀνδράσι* denotes the fighting population of Asia: there the fighters of Hellas as compared with Asiatics.

5. **τῆς ἄνω Ἀσίης.** E. of the Halys, cp. 1. 6, 72, 95, 177.

6. **ὡς καὶ πρότερον.** 1. 103-107. The phrase proves nothing concerning the original order of composition.

Though nomad hordes had swept over civilized Asia, an *ἀρχὴ* of the Scyths is hardly to be admitted (*pace* Guest, *Origines Celticae* i. 17). The idea illustrates a pragmatic tendency towards artificial combinations and perspective in historiography. There are other misconceptions in the passage. That the Scyths entered Asia 'in pursuit of' the Kimmerians is very doubtful; that the Median overlordship preceded the invasion of the nomads is certainly not true. The number of years (28) is also suspect. On these three points see further Appendix I.

2 πολλόν, ἐφοίτεον παρὰ τοὺς δούλους. τοὺς δὲ δούλους οἱ Σκύθαι πάντας τυφλοῦσι τοῦ γάλακτος εἵνεκεν τοῦ πίνουσι ποιεῦντες ὧδε. ἐπεὰν φυσητῆρας λάβωσι ὀστεΐνους αὐλοῖσι προσεμφερεστάτους, τούτους ἐσθέντες ἐς τῶν θηλέων ἵππων τὰ ἄρθρα φυσῶσι τοῖσι στόμασι, ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλων φυσώντων ἀμέλγουσι. φασὶ δὲ τοῦδε εἵνεκα τοῦτο ποιέειν· τὰς φλέβας τε πίμπλασθαι φυσωμένας τῆς ἵππου καὶ τὸ οὖθαρ κατίεσθαι. ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀμέλξωσι τὸ γάλα, ἐσχέαντες ἐς ξύλινα ἀγγήια κοῖλα καὶ περιστίξαντες κατὰ τὰ ἀγγήια τοὺς τυφλοὺς δονέουσι τὸ γάλα, καὶ τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστάμενον ἀπαρύσαντες ἡγεῦνται εἶναι τιμιώτερον, τὸ δ' ὑπιστάμενον ἧσσον τοῦ ἑτέρου. τούτων μὲν εἵνεκα ἅπαντα τὸν ἂν λάβωσι οἱ Σκύθαι ἐκτυφλοῦσι· οὐ γὰρ

---

2. 1. τοὺς δὲ δούλους. This chapter comes in awkwardly, the matter it contains is suspicious, and the logic (τοῦ γάλακτος εἵνεκεν) questionable; but these considerations are not sufficient to call its authenticity into question. Stein supposes it a later insertion by the author himself; and attempts have been made to diminish its harshness by emendation and rearrangement. That mare's milk was a principal item in Scythian diet is certain, and that the yield was increased by some such strange operation as is here described is probable (see Rawlinson, *ad locum*). It may be further argued from the passage that even the nomad Scyths possessed slaves, and Rawlinson apparently accepts the statement that the slaves were all blinded. But in c. 20 *infra* we are told that the Scyths between the river Gerrhos and 'the Trench' consider all the other Scyths their slaves. We are evidently dealing with inexact terms and ideas. Blindness is said to be common in South Russia (*vide* Baehr *ad l.*), and blind men, whether bond or free, could make themselves useful in preparing the *koumiss*, though they could not guide a plough, or look after droves of cattle. Slaves were of course largely exported from Scythia to Athens, but koumiss was apparently not generally known to the Hellenes, or this passage would, perhaps, not have been inserted. φασὶ does not prove that Herodotus saw the process or its result, or even that it was explained to him personally by native Scyths (cp. Introduction, § 20, pp. lxxvii ff.). Neumann, *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*, p. 279, calls the story *eine abgeschmackte Erzählung*, and is shocked by Hdt.'s logic, or want of logic: Rawlinson thinks the blindness adapted to *pastoral* life, an opinion directly traversed by Stein, who thinks there is some etymological confusion at the base of the story: the Scyths gave slaves a name which Greeks mistranslated τυφλοί—hinc illae lacrymae (cp. Schol. ad Aristoph. *Eq.* 959 Φαεινὸς μολγὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ τυφλόν. Ἡρόδοτος δὲ ἱστορεῖ τοὺς Μολγοὺς τούτους ἐπάνω τῆς Σκυθίας εἶναι. On which Dobree: Phainus videtur transtulisse ad Hippemolgos quae tradit Herodotus de Arimaspis. Phainos seems also to have misunderstood the word μολγός, Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* ii. 966, but that does not here concern us). Anyway, as Hansen (*Ost-Europa* §§ 16-202) points out, Hdt. is guilty of an inconsequence, in not explaining the connexion between the blindness of the slaves and the preparation of the milk: and no rearrangement of the text cures this defect. "Fabula perobscura," van Herwerden.

8. **κοῖλα.** Tr. 'capacious,' 'roomy,' or 'deep' (Krüger).

9. **περιστίξαντες.** The MSS. vary; περιστίξαντες α (AB), περιστήσαντες β (PR) which seems to make Dobree's conjecture πέριξ στήσαντες almost certain. περιέστιξε in c. 202 *infra* militates against περιστίξαντες here.

12. **οὐ . . νομάδες.** Stein transfers so as to follow πίνουσι *supra*. The transposition may obviate the inconsequence of the remark, but does not diminish its inconsistency with subsequent passages, cc. 17, 18 *infra*. The whole chapter must be limited to the 'Royal' Scyths, c. 20 *infra*.

ἀρόται εἰσὶ ἀλλὰ νομάδες. ἐκ τούτων δὴ ὦν σφι τῶν δούλων 3 *καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐτράφη νεότης· οἳ ἐπείτε ἔμαθον τὴν σφετέρην γένεσιν, ἠντιοῦντο αὐτοῖσι κατιοῦσι ἐκ τῶν Μήδων. καὶ πρῶτα μὲν τὴν χώρην ἀπετάμοντο, τάφρον ὀρυξάμενοι εὐρέαν κατατείνουσαν ἐκ τῶν Ταυρικῶν ὀρέων ἐς τὴν Μαιῆτιν λίμνην, τῇ περ ἐστὶ μεγίστη· μετὰ δὲ πειρωμένοισι ἐσβάλλειν τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι ἀντικατιζόμενοι ἐμάχοντο. γινομένης δὲ μάχης πολλάκις καὶ οὐ δυναμένων οὐδὲν πλέον ἔχειν τῶν Σκυθέων τῇ μάχῃ, εἷς αὐτῶν ἔλεξε τάδε. "οἷα ποιεῦμεν, ἄνδρες Σκύθαι· δούλοισι τοῖσι ἡμετέροισι μαχόμενοι αὐτοί τε κτεινόμενοι ἐλάσσονες γινόμεθα καὶ ἐκείνους κτείνοντες ἐλασσόνων τὸ λοιπὸν ἄρξομεν. νῦν ὦν μοι δοκέει αἰχμὰς μὲν καὶ τόξα μετεῖναι, λαβόντα δὲ ἕκαστον τοῦ ἵππου τὴν μάστιγα ἰέναι ἆσσον αὐτῶν. μέχρι μὲν γὰρ ὥρων ἡμέας ὅπλα ἔχοντας, οἱ δὲ ἐνόμιζον ὅμοιοί τε καὶ ἐξ ὁμοίων ἡμῖν εἶναι· ἐπεὰν δὲ ἴδωνται μάστιγας ἀντὶ ὅπλων ἔχοντας, μαθόντες ὡς εἰσὶ ἡμέτεροι δοῦλοι καὶ συγγνόντες τοῦτο, οὐκ ὑπομενέουσι." ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες οἱ Σκύθαι ἐποίευν* 4 *ἐπιτελέα· οἱ δὲ ἐκπλαγέντες τῷ γινομένῳ τῆς μάχης τε ἐπελάθοντο καὶ ἔφευγον. οὕτω οἱ Σκύθαι τῆς τε Ἀσίης ἦρξαν καὶ ἐξελασθέντες αὖτις ὑπὸ Μήδων κατῆλθον τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ἐς τὴν σφετέρην. τῶνδε εἵνεκα ὁ Δαρεῖος τίσασθαι βουλόμενος συνήγειρε ἐπ' αὐτοὺς στράτευμα.*

---

3. 2. **νεότης.** The notion of a kindred but inferior clan, or stratum, as being the offspring of free-born women and base or servile fathers is common. Well-known instances are those of the Partheniae at Sparta, see the foundation legend of Tarentum, Strabo, 278 (ed. Teubn. 1, 382), Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 7, 2, 1306 b the Argive 'slaves' at Tiryns (6. 83 *infra*), the Pelasgo-Athenians in Lemnos (6. 138 *infra*). A legend could only have incorporated such a motive after society had entered the patriarchal stage. The story here is inconsistent, as Stein points out, with the view taken in c. 11 *infra*, and 1. 103, as it implies that the Scyths settled in Europe for a time before pursuing the Kimmerii into Asia. Hdt. seems unconscious of the inconsistency. Further, the report of the *ipsissima verba* of the Scythian orator, and the *formulae* used by him (specially *ὅμοιοί τε καὶ ἐξ ὁμοίων*), do not render the story more probable. It has a flavour of Greek political philosophy about it: a moral for Greek slave-states.

4. **τάφρον.** Cp. c. 20 *infra*. This trench is a puzzle to the geographers. Did it run E. and W. across the isthmus of Perikop, and divide the Crimea from the mainland, or did it run N. and S. within the Crimea, cutting off the Eastern portion of the peninsula? In after times at least there was a trench in the former situation; the mention of the mountains favours the latter supposition, and the majority of commentators adopt it, the rather as in c. 20 *infra* this *τάφρος* is represented as forming part of the E. frontier of the Scyths royal, and so seems to run N. and S. The misconception of the situation and lie of the Crimea, c. 99 *infra*, renders this supposition tenable. But there was probably more than one *τάφρος* in Scythia, and Hdt.'s ignorance of the true site and shape of the Crimea, and the questionable character of the tradition about the *τυφλοί* and their sons, discredit any fixed identification.

4. 5. **τῶνδε εἵνεκα.** On the freedom which Herodotus adopts or allows him-

5 Ὡς δὲ Σκύθαι λέγουσι, νεώτατον πάντων ἐθνέων εἶναι τὸ σφέτερον, τοῦτο δὲ γενέσθαι ὧδε. ἄνδρα γενέσθαι πρῶτον ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ ἐούσῃ ἐρήμῳ τῷ οὔνομα εἶναι Ταργιτάον· τοῦ δὲ Ταργιτάου τούτου τοὺς τοκέας λέγουσι εἶναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, λέγουσι δ' ὦν, Δία τε καὶ Βορυσθένεος τοῦ ποταμοῦ θυγατέρα. γένεος μὲν τοιούτου δή τινος γενέσθαι τὸν Ταργιτάον, τούτου δὲ γενέσθαι παῖδας τρεῖς, Λιπόξαϊν καὶ Ἀρπόξαϊν καὶ νεώτατον Κολάξαϊν. ἐπὶ τούτων ἀρχόντων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ φερόμενα χρύσεα ποιήματα, ἄροτρόν τε καὶ ζυγὸν καὶ σάγαριν καὶ φιάλην, πεσεῖν ἐς τὴν Σκυθικήν· καὶ τῶν ἰδόντα πρῶτον τὸν πρεσβύτατον ἆσσον ἰέναι βουλόμενον αὐτὰ λαβεῖν, τὸν δὲ χρυσὸν ἐπιόντος καίεσθαι· ἀπαλλαχθέντος δὲ τούτου προσιέναι τὸν δεύτερον, καὶ τὸν αὖτις ταὐτὰ ποιέειν. τοὺς μὲν δὴ καιόμενον τὸν χρυσὸν ἀπώσασθαι, τρίτῳ δὲ τῷ νεωτάτῳ ἐπελθόντι κατασβῆναι, καί μιν ἐκεῖνον κομίσαι ἐς ἑωυτοῦ· καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἀδελφεοὺς πρὸς ταῦτα συγγνόντας τὴν
6 βασιληίην πᾶσαν παραδοῦναι τῷ νεωτάτῳ. ἀπὸ μὲν δὴ Λιποξάιος γεγονέναι τούτους τῶν Σκυθέων οἳ Αὐχάται γένος καλέονται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μέσου Ἀρποξάιος οἳ Κατίαροί τε καὶ Τράσπιες καλέονται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ νεωτάτου αὐτῶν τοῦ βασιλέος

---

self in the motivation of actions, see Introduction, § 21.

5. 1. ὡς δὲ Σκύθαι λέγουσι. See Introduction, § 20, p. lxxix.

On the Scythian Legend (cc. 8-13), see Appendix I.

νεώτατον. Cp. Justin 2. 1, 5 Scytharum gens antiquissima semper habita, quamquam inter Scythas et Aegyptios diu contentio de generis vetustate fuerit. Herodotus knows nothing of this dispute, though he records a philological experiment made by Psammetichos by which the priority of the Phrygians to the Aegyptians was thought to have been demonstrated, 2. 2.

4. **ἐμοὶ . . ὦν.** An even more tolerant formula is found elsewhere, *e.g.* 42 *infra*; a more decisive rejection, c. 25 *infra*. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

9. **ποιήματα.** These four may be regarded as the prime instruments of the local culture; their inventors' names had been forgotten. The golden models were objects of worship (fetish). (On the worship of gold cp. Prof. Paley, in *Contemp. Review*, Aug. 1884. Very quaint, deriving the use of gold from Sun worship.) A humorous case of Gold worship in Tylor, *Prim. Culture* ii. 154. Gold was native in Scythia, and exported; it is chiefly found in the Ural district, and, be it observed, to the east of the mountains. See Stanford's *Compendium of Geography*: Europe p. 184; Schrader, *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples* (transl. by F. B. Jevons, 1890), Part iii. ch. iv. pp. 175, 179.

6. 4. τοῦ βασιλέος. Holder reads *τοὺς βασιλέας*, Wesseling *τοὺς βασιληίους*. Would it not be better to cut out the first *τ. β.* altogether? The omission of the proper name Kolaxais is observable, after the introduction of the two other proper names, Lipoxais and Arpoxais. Could it be that Hdt. felt a misgiving about the derivation of the name Skoloti from the king's name? Or did the text originally run (omitting the first *τοῦ βασιλέος*) *Σκολότους Σκολότου βασιλέος ἐπωνυμίην*, as Abicht and Stein suggest? But Skoloti might come of Kolaxais: or rather, perhaps, Kolaxais of Skoloti. Stein favours the derivation of *Scyth* from a word meaning to shoot with the bow: Rawlinson takes *Σκύθης*

οἳ καλέονται Παραλάται· σύμπασι δὲ εἶναι οὔνομα Σκολότους,
τοῦ βασιλέος ἐπωνυμίην. Σκύθας δὲ Ἕλληνες ὠνόμασαν.
γεγονέναι μέν νύν σφεας ὧδε λέγουσι οἱ Σκύθαι, ἔτεα δὲ σφίσι 7
ἐπείτε γεγόνασι τὰ σύμπαντα λέγουσι εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου
βασιλέος Ταργιτάου ἐς τὴν Δαρείου διάβασιν τὴν ἐπὶ σφέας
χιλίων οὐ πλέω ἀλλὰ τοσαῦτα. τὸν δὲ χρυσὸν τοῦτον τὸν
ἱρὸν φυλάσσουσι οἱ βασιλέες ἐς τὰ μάλιστα, καὶ θυσίῃσι
μεγάλῃσι ἱλασκόμενοι μετέρχονται ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος. ὃς δ' ἂν
ἔχων τὸν χρυσὸν τὸν ἱρὸν ἐν τῇ ὁρτῇ ὑπαίθριος κατακοιμηθῇ,
οὗτος λέγεται ὑπὸ Σκυθέων οὐ διενιαυτίζειν· δίδοσθαι δέ οἱ διὰ
τοῦτο ὅσα ἂν ἵππῳ ἐν ἡμέρῃ μιῇ περιελάσῃ αὐτός. τῆς δὲ

= Σακάθης = Saka, the Persian name (*perhaps* connected with skyta, schützen, shoot).

The tripartition of the Skoloti or Scyths is implied in this legendary pedigree, and perhaps also a sense that the Paralatae (Royal, Nomad) Scyths were the last comers. Compare the Hellenic pedigree of Aeolians, Dorians, Ionians and Achaians, in which, however, the tribes are classified rather in the order of Hellenic dignity, than in the order of chronological precedence.

In the next chapter a tripartition of the Paralatae, or of their territory, is ascribed to Kolaxais (*sic*), so that he, like his father Targitaos, is supposed to have had three sons. These three kingdoms reappear in c. 120 as the kingdom of Skopasis (to which the Sauromatae are joined), the kingdom of Idanthyrsos, the largest, and the kingdom of Taxakis (with which the Geloni and Budini are associated). From c. 10 it might be inferred that a tripartition lay between Agathyrsi, Scyths and Geloni: that being in a story from another source.

7. 4. **χιλίων** may be merely a round number for an indefinite number of years, or may be based upon royal genealogies, probably imaginary, going back thirty generations. Van Herwerden deletes Ταργιτάου.

χρυσόν. This passage on the 'sacred gold' and its cult is very mysterious. (1) It comes in to break the immediate connexion. (2) It is incomplete and obscure in itself. (3) No reference is made to this cult in the subsequent passages where Hdt. dilates on the religion of the Scyths, cc. 59-63. (4) The χρυσὸς = the χρύσεα ποιήματα c. 5 *supra*, which include an ἄροτρον, surely a strange implement to be worshipped by the Nomads. (5) The exact nature of a σάγαρις is doubtful: 7. 64 seems to identify it with ἀξίνη. The cult of the golden σάγαρις contrasts with the better authenticated cult of the iron ἀκινάκης c. 62 *infra*. (6) Private property in land among the Nomads is improbable; and the enormous scale upon which it is granted—as much as he can ride round in a whole day (sunrise to sunset?)—does not make it more credible. That the Scythic kings had gold cups is certain (cp. cc. 8, 71 *infra*): for the rest, we seem to be in contact with a genuine gold-myth, or treasure-saga: though it might be rash to assert that in the annual feast and sacrifice, the sleep *sub Jove*, the day's ride, and the death within the year, we have indications of the source and symbolism of the supposed cult. There is nothing to show that Hdt. himself had seen the sacred gold treasure, guarded so jealously by the 'kings,' and fraught with such dire fatality to its guardian; there is no reason to believe that he had his direct knowledge of it from other than a Greek source, though the fable has a genuine native and primitive ring in it, worthy of the *Edda*.

8. **διὰ τοῦτο.** For going to sleep? or for guarding the gold and taking the risk of being overcome by supernatural sleep? If he went to sleep it was feared, perchance, that the Niflings would come and steal or recover the gold. A 'griffin' would have done the service on lower terms or even perhaps a one-eyed man, like Hagen—*vide* cc. 13 and 27 *infra*.

χώρης ἐούσης μεγάλης τριφασίας τὰς βασιληίας τοῖσι παισὶ τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ καταστήσασθαι Κολάξαϊν, καὶ τουτέων μίαν ποιῆσαι μεγίστην, ἐν τῇ τὸν χρυσὸν φυλάσσεσθαι. τὰ δὲ κατύπερθε πρὸς βορέην λέγουσι ἄνεμον τῶν ὑπεροίκων τῆς χώρης οὐκ οἷά τε εἶναι ἔτι προσωτέρω οὔτε ὁρᾶν οὔτε διεξιέναι ὑπὸ πτερῶν κεχυμένων· πτερῶν γὰρ καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν ἠέρα εἶναι πλέον, καὶ ταῦτα εἶναι τὰ ἀποκληίοντα τὴν ὄψιν.

8 Σκύθαι μὲν ὧδε ὑπὲρ σφέων τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς χώρης τῆς κατύπερθε λέγουσι, Ἑλλήνων δὲ οἱ τὸν Πόντον οἰκέοντες ὧδε. Ἡρακλέα ἐλαύνοντα τὰς Γηρυόνεω βοῦς ἀπικέσθαι ἐς γῆν ταύτην ἐοῦσαν ἐρήμην, ἥντινα νῦν Σκύθαι νέμονται. Γηρυόνεα δὲ οἰκέειν ἔξω τοῦ Πόντου, κατοικημένον τὴν Ἕλληνες λέγουσι Ἐρύθειαν νῆσον τὴν πρὸς Γαδείροισι τοῖσι ἔξω Ἡρακλέων στηλέων ἐπὶ τῷ Ὠκεανῷ. τὸν δὲ Ὠκεανὸν λόγῳ μὲν λέγουσι ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολέων ἀρξάμενον γῆν περὶ πᾶσαν ῥέειν, ἔργῳ δὲ οὐκ ἀποδεικνῦσι. ἐνθεῦτεν τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὴν νῦν Σκυθίην χώρην καλεομένην, καὶ καταλαβεῖν γὰρ αὐτὸν χειμῶνά τε καὶ κρυμόν, ἐπειρυσάμενον τὴν λεοντέην κατυπνῶσαι, τὰς δέ οἱ ἵππους [τὰς] ὑπὸ τοῦ ἅρματος νεμομένας ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἀφανισθῆναι θείῃ

---

11. **ἑωυτοῦ.** Kolaxais, himself the youngest of three brothers, after excluding his two elder brothers from the kingdom, divides it among his own three sons.

15. **πτερῶν.** Cp. c. 31 *infra*.

8. 2. **Ἑλλήνων.** A list of the principal Greek cities on the Pontos is given by Rawlinson *in l.*, cp. Kiepert, *Manual of A. Geography* §§ 184, 190, or Grote, iii. 60, Ed. 1872, Pt. ii. c. xvii. The expression used by Hdt. would of course cover Greeks on all coasts of the Pontos, but it is not to be supposed that the Greeks were unanimous in preferring this Heraklean legend. Possibly the story would be especially popular in Herakleia Pontica. It is characteristically Greek. A Herakleid lineage is provided for the Scythic kings, and an Hellenic claim to the soil thereby established. Cp. the Herakleid legend in Peloponnese (6. 55 *infra*), the Herakleid genealogy in Lydia (1. 7), and the story of Dorieus and the projected colony in Sicily (5. 43 *infra*). Certain touches in the native legend and custom are preserved; the number (3) of sons, the preference to the youngest, the bow, the drinking cup.

5. **ἔξω τ. Π. . . ἔξω Ἡ. σ.** A rather clumsy description, due perhaps to the fact that only the first vague indication was contained in the source, the second and fuller specification being an addition. This is the only mention of Gades in Herodotus (cp. 5. 9 *infra*).

The Herakles whose pillars were at Gades was the Tyrian, and this legend, intended to satisfy Hellenic feeling, suggests (to us) the idea that the Phoenicians were in the Pontos before the Greeks. Cp. c. 82 *infra*. The version in Diodorus, 2. 43, substitutes Zeus for Herakles, perhaps an improvement from a Greek point of view (cp. 2. 21, 23, and c. 36 *infra*).

Hdt.'s rejection of the ocean-stream theory probably fortified him in his rejection of this legend, which took that theory apparently for granted. Hekataios had previously rejected it: Arrian, *Anab.* 2. 16. Herakles was perhaps supposed to return from Erytheia by ocean, or its shore: otherwise it would be difficult to justify the introduction in this place of the ocean. In this advent of the Tyrian Herakles to Scythia from the land side (N. or N.W.), have we a confession or confusion of old trade-routes from the Baltic to the Euxine? (Cp. c. 33 *infra*.)

τύχῃ. ὡς δ' ἐγερθῆναι τὸν Ἡρακλέα, δίζησθαι, πάντα δὲ τῆς 9
χώρης ἐπεξελθόντα τέλος ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὴν Ὑλαίην καλεομένην γῆν· ἐνθαῦτα δὲ αὐτὸν εὑρεῖν ἐν ἄντρῳ μιξοπάρθενόν τινα, ἔχιδναν διφυέα, τῆς τὰ μὲν ἄνω ἀπὸ τῶν γλουτῶν εἶναι γυναικός, τὰ δὲ ἔνερθε ὄφιος. ἰδόντα δὲ καὶ θωμάσαντα ἐπειρέσθαι μιν εἴ κου ἴδοι ἵππους πλανωμένας· τὴν δὲ φάναι ἑωυτὴν ἔχειν καὶ οὐκ ἀποδώσειν ἐκείνῳ πρὶν ἢ οἱ μιχθῇ· τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλέα μιχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ μισθῷ τούτῳ. κείνην τε δὴ ὑπερβάλλεσθαι τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῶν ἵππων, βουλομένην ὡς πλεῖστον χρόνον συνεῖναι τῷ Ἡρακλέι, καὶ τὸν κομισάμενον ἐθέλειν ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι· τέλος δὲ ἀποδιδοῦσαν αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν "ἵππους μὲν δὴ ταύτας ἀπικομένας ἐνθάδε ἔσωσά τοι ἐγώ, σῶστρά τε σὺ παρέσχες· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ σεῦ τρεῖς παῖδας ἔχω. τούτους, ἐπεὰν γένωνται τρόφιες, ὅ τι χρὴ ποιέειν, ἐξηγέο σύ, εἴτε αὐτοῦ κατοικίζω (χώρης γὰρ τῆσδε ἔχω τὸ κράτος αὐτή) εἴτε ἀποπέμπω παρὰ σέ." τὴν μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐπειρωτᾶν, τὸν δὲ λέγουσι πρὸς ταῦτα εἰπεῖν "ἐπεὰν ἀνδρωθέντας ἴδῃ τοὺς παῖδας, τάδε ποιεῦσα οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτάνοις· τὸν μὲν ἂν ὁρᾷς αὐτῶν τόδε τὸ τόξον ὧδε διατεινόμενον καὶ τῷ ζωστῆρι τῷδε κατὰ τάδε ζωννύμενον, τοῦτον μὲν τῆσδε τῆς χώρης οἰκήτορα ποιεῦ· ὃς δ' ἂν τούτων τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐντέλλομαι λείπηται, ἔκπεμπε ἐκ τῆς χώρης. καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῦσα αὐτή τε εὐφρανέαι καὶ τὰ ἐντεταλμένα
ποιήσεις." τὸν μὲν δὴ εἰρύσαντα τῶν τόξων τὸ ἕτερον (δύο γὰρ 10
δὴ φορέειν τέως Ἡρακλέα) καὶ τὸν ζωστῆρα προδέξαντα, παραδοῦναι τὸ τόξον τε καὶ τὸν ζωστῆρα ἔχοντα ἐπ' ἄκρης τῆς συμβολῆς φιάλην χρυσέην, δόντα δὲ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι. τὴν δ', ἐπεί οἱ γενομένους τοὺς παῖδας ἀνδρωθῆναι, τοῦτο μέν σφι οὐνόματα θέσθαι, τῷ μὲν Ἀγάθυρσον αὐτῶν, τῷ δ' ἐπομένῳ Γελωνόν, Σκύθην δὲ τῷ νεωτάτῳ, τοῦτο δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς μεμνημένην αὐτὴν ποιῆσαι τὰ ἐντεταλμένα. καὶ δὴ δύο μέν οἱ τῶν παίδων, τόν τε Ἀγάθυρσον καὶ τὸν Γελωνόν, οὐκ οἵους τε γενομένους ἐξικέσθαι πρὸς τὸν προκείμενον ἄεθλον, οἴχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς χώρης ἐκβληθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς γειναμένης, τὸν δὲ νεώτατον αὐτῶν Σκύθην ἐπιτελέσαντα καταμεῖναι ἐν τῇ χώρῃ. καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν Σκύθεω τοῦ Ἡρακλέος γενέσθαι τοὺς αἰεὶ βασιλέας γινομένους Σκυθέων, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς φιάλης ἔτι καὶ ἐς τόδε φιάλας ἐκ τῶν ζωστήρων φορέειν Σκύθας· τὸ δὴ μοῦνον μηχανήσασθαι τὴν μητέρα Σκύθῃ. ταῦτα δὲ Ἑλλήνων οἱ τὸν Πόντον οἰκέοντες λέγουσι.

Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ 11

---

11. 1. **ἔστι δὲ καί.** This ξυνὸς Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ βαρβάρων λεγόμενος λόγος certainly commends itself to the mind of to-day, as to Hdt., in preference to the

αὐτὸς πρόσκειμαι, Σκύθας τοὺς νομάδας οἰκέοντας ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ, πολέμῳ πιεσθέντας ὑπὸ Μασσαγετέων, οἴχεσθαι διαβάντας ποταμὸν Ἀράξην ἐπὶ γῆν τὴν Κιμμερίην (τὴν γὰρ νῦν νέμονται Σκύθαι, αὕτη λέγεται τὸ παλαιὸν εἶναι Κιμμερίων), τοὺς δὲ Κιμμερίους ἐπιόντων Σκυθέων βουλεύεσθαι ὡς στρατοῦ ἐπιόντος μεγάλου, καὶ δὴ τὰς γνώμας σφέων κεχωρισμένας, ἐντόνους μὲν ἀμφοτέρας, ἀμείνω δὲ τὴν τῶν βασιλέων· τὴν μὲν γὰρ δὴ τοῦ δήμου φέρειν γνώμην ὡς ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι πρῆγμα εἴη μηδὲ πρὸ σποδοῦ μένοντας κινδυνεύειν, τὴν δὲ τῶν βασιλέων διαμάχεσθαι περὶ τῆς χώρης τοῖσι ἐπιοῦσι. οὔκων δὴ ἐθέλειν πείθεσθαι οὔτε τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι τὸν δῆμον οὔτε τῷ δήμῳ τοὺς βασιλέας· τοὺς μὲν δὴ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι βουλεύεσθαι ἀμαχητὶ τὴν χώρην παραδόντας τοῖσι ἐπιοῦσι· τοῖσι δὲ βασιλεῦσι δόξαι ἐν τῇ ἑωυτῶν κεῖσθαι ἀποθανόντας μηδὲ συμφεύγειν τῷ δήμῳ, λογισαμένους ὅσα τε ἀγαθὰ πεπόνθασι καὶ ὅσα φεύγοντας ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος κακὰ

'Scythic' or 'Helleno-Pontic' traditions. One is tempted to make the Greeks responsible mainly for the form of the tradition, reproducing as it does the terminology and motives of Greek politicians, and to refer the matter mainly to the barbarians; and further, to understand by 'barbarians' in this passage the Kimmerian refugees, and by Greeks, those of Sinope. In accepting this tradition as in the main the historical one we are not committed to the belief that the Kimmerians voluntarily vacated their territory, and that all the fighting was confined to the heroic duel between the chieftains. It is hardly likely that the refugees at Sinope were drawn wholly from 'the masses,' or reached their new home without chiefs, and told a story there so much to their own discredit. (Rawlinson is wrong in translating *βασιλέας* "Royal *tribe*.")

Hdt. makes himself responsible for the geography of this tradition, but it involves a grave difficulty. Whether the Araxes, here taken as the boundary between Asiatic Scythia and European Kimmeria, answer to the great river usually understood by that name, or to the Wolga, or to some other, in any case it must be sought far eastwards of the Tyras (Dniestr), beside which the last resting-place of the Kimmerians is set. This consideration drives us, in rationalising the legend, upon Niebuhr's hypothesis (apparently favoured by Rawlinson), that the Kimmerians quitted Europe and made their way to Sinope, not by the Caucasus, but by the Thracian Bosporos. Or, might they not have found their way across the sea? The real point of this tradition remains that the Scythians superseded and drove out the Kimmerians in South Russia, coming themselves from Asia, and further East. Cp. Appendix I.

9. **πρὸ σποδοῦ** is an emendation of Stein's on the MSS. which read *πρὸς πολλοὺς* (β) or *πρὸ πολλοῦ* (α), and he compares 8. 74 *πρὸ χώρης δοριαλώτου μένοντας μάχεσθαι*. The parallel is not extensive or exact. It justifies *πρὸ* = *ὑπέρ*, but nothing further. The territory of the Kimmerians is not in the hands of the Scyths as Attica in the hands of Xerxes, and *σποδοῦ* for *χώρης* or *χώρης ἁλωτοῦ* or such expression, is without other example. *σποδός*=*pulvis* c. 172 *infra* of course proves nothing. In c. 35 *infra* the word is used in its strict meaning. Kallenberg, Holder, and others read *πρὸς πολλούς*.

10. **μένοντας** is another difficulty. The MSS. give *δεόμενον*, *δεόμενα* and *γινόμενα*. Reiske emends *δεομένων*, which Holder and van Herwerden adopt. Valckenaer reads *οὐδὲν δέον μένοντας*, Buttmann *δέοι μένοντας*, Bredovius *μένοντας* (omitting *δέοι*), and this last is adopted by Kallenberg, ed. Teubn. Stein in his annotated ed.[3] 1877, reads and defends *δεόμενον* = *δέον*: cp. Soph. *O. C.* 570, Plat. *Men.* 79 *δεῖσθαι* for *δεῖν*.

ἐπίδοξα καταλαμβάνειν. ὡς δὲ δόξαι σφι ταῦτα, διαστάντας καὶ
ἀριθμὸν ἴσους γενομένους μάχεσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους. καὶ τοὺς
μὲν ἀποθανόντας πάντας ὑπ' ἑωυτῶν θάψαι τὸν δῆμον τῶν
Κιμμερίων παρὰ ποταμὸν Τύρην (καί σφεων ἔτι δῆλός ἐστι ὁ
τάφος), θάψαντας δὲ οὕτω τὴν ἔξοδον ἐκ τῆς χώρης ποιέεσθαι·
Σκύθας δὲ ἐπελθόντας λαβεῖν τὴν χώρην ἐρήμην. καὶ νῦν ἔστι 12
μὲν ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ Κιμμέρια τείχεα, ἔστι δὲ πορθμήια Κιμμέρια,
ἔστι δὲ καὶ χώρη οὔνομα Κιμμερίη, ἔστι δὲ Βόσπορος Κιμμέριος
καλεόμενος· φαίνονται δὲ οἱ Κιμμέριοι φυγόντες ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην
τοὺς Σκύθας καὶ τὴν χερσόνησον κτίσαντες, ἐν τῇ νῦν Σινώπη
πόλις Ἑλλὰς οἴκισται. φανεροὶ δέ εἰσι καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι διώξαντες
αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐσβαλόντες ἐς γῆν τὴν Μηδικήν, ἁμαρτόντες τῆς
ὁδοῦ· οἱ μὲν γὰρ Κιμμέριοι αἰεὶ τὴν παρὰ θάλασσαν ἔφευγον, οἱ
δὲ Σκύθαι ἐν δεξιῇ τὸν Καύκασον ἔχοντες ἐδίωκον ἐς οὗ ἐσέβαλον
ἐς γῆν τὴν Μηδικήν, ἐς μεσόγαιαν τῆς ὁδοῦ τραφθέντες. οὗτος δὲ
ἄλλος ξυνὸς Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ βαρβάρων λεγόμενος λόγος εἴρηται.
Ἔφη δὲ Ἀριστέης ὁ Καϋστροβίου ἀνὴρ Προκοννήσιος 13
ποιέων ἔπεα, ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Ἰσσηδόνας φοιβόλαμπτος γενόμενος,

---

20. **ἔτι δῆλός ἐ. ὁ. τ.** For this remark Hdt. is personally responsible, and it may be based on autopsy, or information gained on the north side of the Pontos. Taken in connexion with the local archaeology adduced in c. 12 *infra* as external evidence in support of the tradition preferred by Hdt., it seems to make for the hypothesis that this barbaro-Hellenic tradition was local in Sinope.

22. **ἐρήμην.** The Scyths have no credit in this tradition for anything but numbers (*στρατοῦ μεγάλου supra*). The Kimmerian chiefs are heroic.

12. 1. **καὶ νῦν.** This chapter consists of four sentences, or, including the recapitulation at the end, of five. The first sentence contains some valuable local archaeology. The second adds a statement which may be accepted as historical. The third is probably a mixture of truth and error, which is raised, in the fourth, into a complete misconception, by a pragmatic combination of unrelated events.

The Kimmerians to avoid the Scyths from Asia are represented as flying eastward into Asia! The Scyths who entered Media, or rather Assyria, were probably not European but Asiatic nomads. See Appendix I.

5. **Σινώπη π. Ἑ.** Sinope was perhaps more, or less, than 'Hellenic'; it was already Athenian, when Hdt. wrote (or revised) this passage (cp. Plutarch, *Per.* c. 20). In any case the phrase illustrates Hdt.'s Hellenic feeling. His sense of the contrast between Hellas and Barbarism is always deeper than his perception of the divisions of Hellas.

13. 1. **ἔφη δέ.** The version of Aristeas has two points in common with the tradition just given: it is at variance with the native Scythic legend, and it ascribes the advent of the Scythians to a general pressure and migratory movement of tribes, a *vera causa.* With Aristeas the pressure originates in the N.E., not in the east, a view which some, with Stein, may prefer. The story is based on Issedonian tradition, c. 16 *infra*, and supported by the existence of the Skoloti east of the Thyssagetae c. 22 *infra.* Hdt. rejects a legend, which, though committed, or supposed to be committed, to writing and vouched for by a well-known name, incorporated one-eyed men, griffins, Hyperboreans, and the ocean: four things which he cannot digest. But he uses it as a negative argument against the 'Scythic' story. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

2. On the Issedones cp. c. 26 *infra.*

Ἰσσηδόνων δὲ ὑπεροικέειν Ἀριμασποὺς ἄνδρας μουνοφθάλμους, ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων τοὺς χρυσοφύλακας γρῦπας, τούτων δὲ τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους κατήκοντας ἐπὶ θάλασσαν. τούτους ὦν πάντας πλὴν Ὑπερβορέων, ἀρξάντων Ἀριμασπῶν, αἰεὶ τοῖσι πλησιοχώροισι ἐπιτίθεσθαι, καὶ ὑπὸ μὲν Ἀριμασπῶν ἐξωθέεσθαι ἐκ τῆς χώρης Ἰσσηδόνας, ὑπὸ δὲ Ἰσσηδόνων Σκύθας, Κιμμερίους δὲ οἰκέοντας ἐπὶ τῇ νοτίῃ θαλάσσῃ ὑπὸ Σκυθέων πιεζομένους ἐκλείπειν τὴν χώρην. οὕτω οὐδὲ οὗτος συμφέρεται περὶ τῆς χώρης ταύτης Σκύθῃσι.

14 καὶ ὅθεν μὲν ἦν Ἀριστέης ὁ ταῦτα εἴπας, εἴρηκα, τὸν δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἤκουον λόγον ἐν Προκοννήσῳ καὶ Κυζίκῳ, λέξω. Ἀριστέην γὰρ λέγουσι, ἐόντα τῶν ἀστῶν οὐδενὸς γένος ὑποδεέστερον, ἐσελθόντα ἐς κναφήιον ἐν Προκοννήσῳ ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ τὸν κναφέα κατακληίσαντα τὸ ἐργαστήριον οἴχεσθαι ἀγγελέοντα τοῖσι προσήκουσι τῷ νεκρῷ. ἐσκεδασμένου δὲ ἤδη τοῦ λόγου ἀνὰ τὴν πόλιν ὡς τεθνεὼς εἴη

---

3. On the Arimaspi and griffins cp. 3. 116 and c. 27 *infra*.

5. On the Hyperboreans cp. c. 32 *infra*.

9. The νοτίη θαλάσση is here of course the Euxine, as compared with the (north) sea mentioned above; the relation of that 'northern sea,' on which dwelt the Hyperboreans, to the Okeanos river does not clearly appear.

10. **ἐκλείπειν.** Cp. cc. 105, 118 *infra*, 6. 100.

14. 2. **τὸν δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ κτλ.** The two chapters 14, 15 contain a remarkable digression upon Aristeas, under which name are combined and confused the real or supposed author of the *Arimaspeia*, extant in Hdt.'s day (Bergk, *Gr. Lit-Gesch.* ii. 99), and a mythical figure, which may be taken as at once the son and the double of the god Apollo himself. To rationalise such stories as are here and elsewhere told of Aristeas into "the alternate appearance and disappearance of an enterprising traveller" (R.) may safely be pronounced ἄγροικός τις σοφία. To deny all historical reality to Aristeas (with Crusius, Roscher's *Lexikon* 2814), is perhaps the excess of scepticism, attributable to an exaggerated 'solarisation' of myths and legends. The date of the historical Aristeas cannot, however, be fixed with any certainty. διηκοσίοισι here is the reading of α (=A+B) supported by ancient citations: β (=R+V) read τριηκοσίοισι. The text would make the date of Aristeas' poem about 690-680 B.C., which may be accepted as an approximation, *pace* Suidas, who makes Aristeas contemporary with Kroisos and Kyros. The poem of Aristeas may have been among the firstfruits of Ionic adventure in the Pontos before any actual Greek colony was established on the northern coast. The settlements are dated to the beginning of the eighth century B.C. Foundation of Kyzikos, *c.* 756 B.C. Refoundation, *c.* 680 B.C. See Busolt, *Gr. Geschicht.* i. 321 f. But cp. Grote, iii. 61, who dates "the mystic poet Aristeas" about 540 B.C. On Aristeas see further Smith, *Dict. Biography* i. 292, the excellent article in Pauly, *R.-E.* i. 1581, and Roscher, *Lexikon* 547 ff. *s.vv.* ARISTAIOS, HYPERBOREER. The historical reality of Aristeas is accepted incidentally by Flach, *Gesch. der Gr. Lyrik* (1883-4), and expressly by Bergk, *l. c. supra*. The passage before us here, if it proves anything, proves that Hdt. visited Prokonnesos and Kyzikos, and at some subsequent time Metapontion. (On the first two, Kiepert, *Man.* § 66, on Metapontion § 235.) It is also valuable as illustrating Hellenic ideas in religion, and the action of Delphi. Artake, a little to the N.W. of Kyzikos. The passage is of the highest importance as a simple and candid revelation of the principles and method of research employed by Hdt. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

ὁ Ἀριστέης, ἐς ἀμφισβασίας τοῖσι λέγουσι ἀπικνέεσθαι ἄνδρα Κυζικηνὸν ἥκοντα ἐξ Ἀρτάκης πόλιος, φάντα συντυχεῖν τέ οἱ ἰόντι ἐπὶ Κυζίκου καὶ ἐς λόγους ἀπικέσθαι. καὶ τοῦτον μὲν ἐντεταμένως ἀμφισβατέειν, τοὺς δὲ προσήκοντας τῷ νεκρῷ ἐπὶ τὸ κναφήιον παρεῖναι ἔχοντας τὰ πρόσφορα ὡς ἀναιρησομένους· ἀνοιχθέντος δὲ τοῦ οἰκήματος οὔτε τεθνεῶτα οὔτε ζῶντα φαίνεσθαι Ἀριστέην. μετὰ δὲ ἑβδόμῳ ἔτεϊ φανέντα αὐτὸν ἐς Προκόννησον ποιῆσαι τὰ ἔπεα ταῦτα τὰ νῦν ὑπ' Ἑλλήνων Ἀριμάσπεα καλέεται, ποιήσαντα δὲ ἀφανισθῆναι τὸ δεύτερον. ταῦτα μὲν αἱ πόλιες αὗται λέγουσι, τάδε δὲ οἶδα Μεταποντίνοισι 15
τοῖσι ἐν Ἰταλίῃ συγκυρήσαντα μετὰ τὴν ἀφάνισιν τὴν δευτέρην Ἀριστέω ἔτεσι τεσσεράκοντα καὶ διηκοσίοισι, ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος ἐν Προκοννήσῳ τε καὶ Μεταποντίῳ εὕρισκον. Μεταποντῖνοί φασι αὐτὸν Ἀριστέην φανέντα σφι ἐς τὴν χώρην κελεῦσαι βωμὸν Ἀπόλλωνος ἱδρύσασθαι καὶ Ἀριστέω τοῦ Προκοννησίου ἐπωνυμίην ἔχοντα ἀνδριάντα παρ' αὐτὸν ἱστάναι· φάναι γάρ σφι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα Ἰταλιωτέων μούνοισι δὴ ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὴν χώρην, καὶ αὐτός οἱ ἕπεσθαι ὁ νῦν ἐὼν Ἀριστέης· τότε δέ, ὅτε εἵπετο τῷ θεῷ, εἶναι κόραξ. καὶ τὸν μὲν εἰπόντα ταῦτα ἀφανισθῆναι, σφέας δὲ Μεταποντίνοι λέγουσι ἐς Δελφοὺς πέμψαντας τὸν θεὸν ἐπειρωτᾶν ὅ τι τὸ φάσμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἴη. τὴν δὲ Πυθίην σφέας κελεύειν πείθεσθαι τῷ φάσματι, πειθομένοισι δὲ ἄμεινον συνοίσεσθαι. καί σφεας δεξαμένους ταῦτα ποιῆσαι ἐπιτελέα. καὶ νῦν ἕστηκε ἀνδριὰς ἐπωνυμίην ἔχων Ἀριστέω παρ' αὐτῷ τῷ ἀγάλματι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, πέριξ δὲ αὐτὸν δάφναι ἑστᾶσι· τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ ἵδρυται. Ἀριστέω μέν νυν πέρι τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω.

Τῆς δὲ γῆς, τῆς πέρι ὅδε ὁ λόγος ὅρμηται λέγεσθαι, οὐδεὶς 16
οἶδε ἀτρεκέως ὅ τι τὸ κατύπερθέ ἐστι· οὐδενὸς γὰρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἰδέναι φαμένου δύναμαι πυθέσθαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ Ἀριστέης, τοῦ περ ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τούτων μνήμην ἐποιεύμην, οὐδὲ οὗτος προσωτέρω Ἰσσηδόνων ἐν αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἔπεσι ποιέων ἔφησε

---

16. 1. **ὅδε ὁ λόγος . . λέγεσθαι.** Of *written* words, and so *εἰρήσεται ad fin.*—and perhaps *ἔλεγε, ἔφησε, φὰς infra.* The λόγος as it stands is not easily defined. It is certainly not identical or co-extensive with Book 4 (Melpomene). Is it even co-extensive with the Scythian portion of the book? Or is it not, rather, to be reduced to the merely geographical passage following (cc. 17-31), defined by the *εἰρήσεται* c. 16, and the *εἴρηται* c. 31, and succeeded by the Delian λόγος cc. 33 ff., and the (rejected) λόγος περὶ Ἀβάριος c. 36? The geographical account of Scythia is a λόγος not merely as told by but as received by Herodotus; based mainly upon hearsay, or script, and little, if at all, upon his own eyesight. See Introduction, § 20.

ἀπικέσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὰ κατύπερθε ἔλεγε ἀκοῇ, φὰς Ἰσσηδόνας εἶναι τοὺς ταῦτα λέγοντας. ἀλλ' ὅσον μὲν ἡμεῖς ἀτρεκέως ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἀκοῇ ἐξικέσθαι, πᾶν εἰρήσεται.

17 *Ἀπὸ τοῦ Βορυσθενεϊτέων ἐμπορίου (τοῦτο γὰρ τῶν παρα-*

---

17. 1. ἀπό. In the passage which follows (cc. 17-31) Hdt. attempts a sketch of the geography and ethnography of Scythia and its surroundings. The relation of this sketch to the subsequent sketch of Scythia (cc. 99-101) is problematic: cp. Appendix II. The method pursued by Hdt. here is apparently to enumerate the tribes in four or five groups from W. to E. and the subordinate members of each group in order from S. to N. as follows: I 1 Kallippidae (Helleno-Scyths), 2 Alazones, 3a Scythic *ἀροτῆρες*, 4 Neuri (c. 17), II 3b Scythic *γεωργοί*, 5 Androphagi (c. 18), III 3c Scythic *νομάδες* (c. 19), 3d Scythic *βασιλήϊοι*, 6 Melanchlaeni (c. 20), IV 7 Sauromatae, 8 Budini, 9 Thyssagetae, 10 Iurki, 3e Scythic *émigrés*, 11 Argippaei (cc. 21-23). We may add as a fifth group V 12 the Issedones (cc. 25, 26), 13 the Arimaspi (c. 27). The descriptive passage is broken by reviews of the sources, or by similar criticism (cc. 24, 25, 27), and succeeded by an essay in the physical geography of the region (cc. 28-31).

It is further evident that the whole passage is composed of three successive flights of somewhat diverse matter and authority, A (cc. 17-20) giving the geography of Scythia proper, 6 tribes, groups I-III., fairly intelligible. B (cc. 21-23) geography of five tribes: Group IV, closed by a review of the sources, and an assertion of their trustworthiness. C (cc. 25, 26) the more or less fabulous tribes round the Issedones and Arimaspi. This last flight lands us fairly in the world of myths. The discussion of one-eyed-men and griffins (c. 27) leads insensibly to other marvels, of climate, and to the rationalisation of the story of the feathers (cc. 28-31). And while in this vein Hdt. adds a discussion of the legend of the Hyperboreans (cc. 32-35), who, if existent, would have crowned the ethnography of the north. This discussion opens up the wider question of ecumenical geography (37 ff.) from which he ingeniously returns *via* the Pontos (46) to the rivers of Scythia.

A (cc. 17-20) gives the geography of Scythia proper in three stages. The first group of tribes between the Hypanis (Bug) and the Borysthenes (Dniepr). The northern limit, north of the Neuri, is desert. The enumeration closes with a confession of ignorance: *ἔρημος ἀνθρώπων, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.* The second group, east of the Borysthenes, is similarly bordered on the north by a desert, and the enumeration closes with the same confession of ignorance: *ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων οὐδέν, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.* Similarly the third group terminates on the north by a desert: *ἐρημός ἐστι ἀνθρώπων, κατόσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.* The core of the first group is formed by the *Σκύθαι ἀροτῆρες*, of the second by the *Σ. γεωργοί* (apparently a distinction without a difference), and of the third by the *Νομάδες*, or rather the Royal horde. Each Scythic division is bordered on the north by a non-Scythic tribe, which intervenes before the desert; these three tribes are the Neuri, the Androphagi, and the Melanchlaeni. This is all beautifully symmetrical, but its architectural symmetry does not render it more plausible. Nor is the ethnography made satisfactory by the omission of the Auchatae Katiari-Traspies and Paralatae of c. 6 *supra*: or, at least, by the neglect of those appellatives. Herodotus is not greatly concerned to harmonise the varying nomenclature employed in his various sources or authorities: yet it is surely an inconsequence, in a passage professing to give an exhaustive account of the geography of the land, to omit all reference to the native ethnography (c. 6). It is also evident that in this passage he has not in view the abstract scheme of Scythian geography given below, cc. 99-101.

The *ἐμπόριον* here is to be identified with the *ἄστυ* c. 78 *infra* and the *πόλις* of c. 79 *infra*. There is no ground, as Rawlinson says, for a substantial distinction, and all three terms denote Olbia. The variation in the terms, however, and the omission of the actual name of the place here, seem to support the view that the passages are taken from various sources, and to augment

θαλασσίων μεσαίτατόν ἐστι πάσης τῆς Σκυθίης), ἀπὸ τούτου
πρῶτοι Καλλιππίδαι νέμονται ἐόντες Ἕλληνες Σκύθαι, ὑπὲρ δὲ
τούτων ἄλλο ἔθνος οἳ Ἀλαζόνες καλέονται. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ
Καλλιππίδαι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατὰ ταὐτὰ Σκύθῃσι ἐπασκέουσι,
σῖτον δὲ καὶ σπείρουσι καὶ σιτέονται, καὶ κρόμμυα καὶ σκόροδα
καὶ φακοὺς καὶ κέγχρους. ὑπὲρ δὲ Ἀλαζόνων οἰκέουσι Σκύθαι
ἀροτῆρες, οἳ οὐκ ἐπὶ σιτήσι σπείρουσι τὸν σῖτον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πρήσι.
τούτων δὲ κατύπερθε οἰκέουσι Νευροί. Νευρῶν δὲ τὸ πρὸς
βορέην ἄνεμον ἔρημον ἀνθρώπων, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. ταῦτα μὲν 18
παρὰ τὸν Ὕπανιν ποταμόν ἐστι ἔθνεα πρὸς ἑσπέρης τοῦ
Βορυσθένεος· ἀτὰρ διαβάντι τὸν Βορυσθένεα ἀπὸ θαλάσσης
πρῶτον μὲν ἡ Ὑλαίη, ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης ἄνω ἰόντι οἰκέουσι Σκύθαι
γεωργοί, τοὺς Ἕλληνες οἱ οἰκέοντες ἐπὶ τῷ Ὑπάνι ποταμῷ

---

the doubt whether Herodotus ever set foot in Scythia proper. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

Rawlinson considers this passage conclusive against Niebuhr's scheme of Scythian geography, on the strength of the word πάσης. If the word πάσης be thus unduly pressed it will result that in this chapter Hdt. places Olbia at the S.E. corner of Scythia, between the Pontus and the Maeotis! In c. 101 *infra* Hdt. clearly places the mouth of the Borysthenes (and therefore virtually Olbia) exactly half-way between the Ister and the Maeotis, *i.e.* bisecting the line of the S. coast. R.'s map, moreover, contradicts his note.

If the word πάσης is rightly to be pressed, it would be better to recognise that this passage may have been written when Hdt. was not thinking of the geographical scheme of Scythia found in cc. 99-101, so that in τὰ παραθαλάσσια he need not have included the coast of the Μαιῆτις λίμνη. Scythia as conceived or implied in this passage is different from Scythia as conceived, much more clearly, in cc. 99-101. (See Appendix II., on the geography of Scythia.)

3. **Ἕλληνες Σκύθαι** can hardly mean Scyths that had adopted Hellenic customs (so Stein), for Hdt. goes on to say that the Kallippidae only differ from Scyths in growing wheat and certain vegetables, cp. c. 76. Still less could the words mean Hellenes turned Scyths. Baehr quotes a psephism of Olbia, *C.I.G.* ii. p. 122, No. 2058, for μιξέλληνας who might represent a mixed race.

4. **Ἀλαζόνες** is the reading of α (A+B). Ἀλιζῶνες of β (R+V+S) is supported by Strabo, and adopted by Kallenberg and Holder. Baehr reads Ἀλαζῶνες. Cp. c. 52 *infra*, where some additional geographical facts are given.

8. **πρήσι.** On the Athenian corn trade with Scythia see Rawlinson, *ad l.*, Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung*, i.[3] 99 etc., Buchsenschütz, *Besitz u. Erwerb*, p. 422, etc. The Neuri are more fully described in another connexion c. 105 *infra*.

18. 4. **ἡ Ὑλαίη.** "The Bush" (Blakesley), which however no longer deserves the name. That a colony of Greeks dwelling upon the Hypanis (Bug) should bear the name of the Borysthenes (Dniepr) is to be explained by the fact that the latter river is the more important. Kiepert, *Manual*, § 190, describes Olbia as situated "on the estuary of the Hypanis, which joins the larger estuary of the Borysthenes." Rawlinson, iii.[3] p. 208, gives a still more exact description of the site. Cp. note to c. 53 *infra*. The colonists may have changed the name of the settlement as it rose from a mere ἐμπόριον to the dignity of a πόλις, but it continued to be better known outside the neighbourhood by the old title, applied to it by Hdt. in c. 78 *infra*; cp. Steph. Byzant. *sub v.* Βορυσθένης. The coins of Olbia, 'in all three metals,' recognise only the new name, but there are apparently none extant of the 5th cent. The bronze coins, however, show a head of the river-god Borysthenes. Cp. B. Head, *Historia Numorum*, p. 233. They would be especially for local use.

καλέουσι Βορυσθενεΐτας, σφέας δὲ αὐτοὺς Ὀλβιοπολίτας.
οὗτοι ὦν οἱ γεωργοὶ Σκύθαι νέμονται τὸ μὲν πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ ἐπὶ
τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὁδοῦ, κατήκοντες ἐπὶ ποταμὸν τῷ οὔνομα κεῖται
Παντικάπης, τὸ δὲ πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον πλόον ἀνὰ τὸν Βορυ-
σθένεα ἡμερέων ἕνδεκα. ἤδη δὲ κατύπερθε τούτων ἡ ἔρημός ἐστι
ἐπὶ πολλόν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἔρημον Ἀνδροφάγοι οἰκέουσι, ἔθνος
ἐὸν ἴδιον καὶ οὐδαμῶς Σκυθικόν. τὸ δὲ τούτων κατύπερθε
ἔρημον ἤδη ἀληθέως καὶ ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων οὐδέν, ὅσον ἡμεῖς
19 ἴδμεν. τὸ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ τῶν γεωργῶν τούτων Σκυθέων, δια-
βάντι τὸν Παντικάπην ποταμόν, νομάδες ἤδη Σκύθαι νέμονται,
οὔτε τι σπείροντες οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀροῦντες· ψιλὴ δὲ δενδρέων ἡ
πᾶσα αὕτη πλὴν τῆς Ὑλαίης. οἱ δὲ νομάδες οὗτοι τὸ πρὸς τὴν
ἠῶ ἡμερέων τεσσέρων καὶ δέκα ὁδὸν νέμονται χώρην κατατεί-
20 νουσαν ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Γέρρον. πέρην δὲ τοῦ Γέρρου ταῦτα δὴ τὰ
καλεύμενα βασιλήιά ἐστι καὶ Σκύθαι οἱ ἄριστοί τε καὶ πλεῖστοι

---

6. **Βορυσθενεΐτας.** *a* reads Βορυσθενείτας. *β* reads Βορυσθενίτας.

7. The name of the γεωργοὶ Σκύθαι seems to cancel one of the distinctions between Scyths and the tribe above mentioned of Kallippidae, viz. agriculture. And the terms ἀροτῆρες and γεωργοὶ both applied to Σκύθαι seem to involve a distinction without a difference.

9. The Pantikapes has not been identified; cp. c. 54 *infra*.

11. Androphagi is obviously a descriptive epithet, and not a substantive tribal name; as such it might have been applied to the Issedones; c. 26 *infra*.

19. 6. The Gerrhos cannot be identified with any certainty; cp. c. 56 *infra*.

20. 2. **οἱ ἄριστοι.** The eastern boundary of this division of Scyths appears to be a line drawn from the trench (cp. c. 3 *supra*) through the emporium called Kremni on the Lake Maeotis, to the river Tanais. From this it appears that the trench is conceived as running rather N. and S. than E. and W. (The form and position of Taurike (the Crimea) beyond the trench are elucidated c. 99 *infra*.) From the next chapter (21) it appears that the end of this line touches the Tanais at its mouth, where it empties into the inner corner (μυχός) of the Palus Maeotis (cp. c. 100 *infra*).

The Melanchlaeni who march with these Royal Scyths on the north are, like the Androphagi, rather described by an epithet than named. Dion Chrys. p. 439 (cp. Stein c. 107) speaks of a γένος Σκυθῶν τῶν Μελαγχλαίνων, and of the descriptive name as due to Greeks. But cp. Rawlinson's n. to c. 107, who thinks it may be a translation of the native name.

B (cc. 21-23) gives us the geography of five or six tribes beyond the Tanais in a territory which has no collective name, but which is divided into several plots (ἡ πρώτη τῶν λαξίων . . . δευτέρην λάξιν . . . ἐν τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι τόποισι) occupied respectively by the Sauromatae, the Budini, the Thyssagetae (and the Iurki), Scythian *émigrés*, and Argippaei; both the physique and situation of these districts being given with confidence, the grounds for which are put forward in c. 24. Herodotus does not pretend to speak as an eye-witness, but it cannot be denied that he was correctly informed of the broad features of the territory, though the symmetrical succession of bare steppe and woodland is somewhat exaggerated. Cp. Stanford's *Europe*, pp. 165 ff. where three zones are recognised on the tableland to the north of the Black Sea, a southern district or steppe proper, succeeded to the north by a 'black earth' region (*op. c.* p. 169). "Higher up the course of the streams thin oak plantations serve as a transition from the steppes to the region of the woodlands" (*op. c.* p. 171). The exact limits, however, of these successive regions are not defined by any hard line.

καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νομίζοντες Σκύθας δούλους σφετέρους εἶναι· κατήκουσι δὲ οὗτοι τὸ μὲν πρὸς μεσαμβρίην ἐς τὴν Ταυρικήν, τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἠῶ ἐπί τε τάφρον, τὴν δὴ οἱ ἐκ τῶν τυφλῶν γενόμενοι ὤρυξαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαιήτιδος τὸ ἐμπόριον τὸ καλέεται Κρημνοί· τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν κατήκουσι ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Τάναϊν. τὰ δὲ κατύπερθε πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον τῶν βασιληίων Σκυθέων οἰκέουσι Μελάγχλαινοι, ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ οὐ Σκυθικόν. Μελαγχλαίνων δὲ τὸ κατύπερθε λίμναι καὶ ἔρημός ἐστι ἀνθρώπων, κατόσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.

Τάναϊν δὲ ποταμὸν διαβάντι οὐκέτι Σκυθική, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν 21
πρώτη τῶν λαξίων Σαυροματέων ἐστί, οἳ ἐκ τοῦ μυχοῦ ἀρξάμενοι
τῆς Μαιήτιδος λίμνης νέμονται τὸ πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον ἡμερέων
πεντεκαίδεκα ὁδόν, πᾶσαν ἐοῦσαν ψιλὴν καὶ ἀγρίων καὶ ἡμέρων
δενδρέων· ὑπεροικέουσι δὲ τούτων δευτέρην λάξιν ἔχοντες Βου-
δῖνοι, γῆν νεμόμενοι πᾶσαν δασέαν ὕλῃ παντοίῃ. Βουδίνων δὲ 22
κατύπερθε πρὸς βορέην ἐστὶ πρώτη μὲν ἔρημος ἐπ' ἡμερέων ἑπτὰ
ὁδόν, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἔρημον ἀποκλίνοντι μᾶλλον πρὸς ἀπηλιώτην
ἄνεμον νέμονται Θυσσαγέται, ἔθνος πολλὸν καὶ ἴδιον· ζῶσι δὲ
ἀπὸ θήρης. συνεχέες δὲ τούτοισι ἐν τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι τόποισι
κατοικημένοι εἰσὶ τοῖσι οὔνομα κεῖται Ἰύρκαι, καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ
θήρης ζῶντες τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· λοχᾷ ἐπὶ δένδρεον ἀναβάς, τὰ δέ
ἐστι πυκνὰ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν χώρην· ἵππος δὲ ἑκάστῳ δεδιδαγμένος
ἐπὶ γαστέρα κεῖσθαι ταπεινότητος εἵνεκα ἕτοιμός ἐστι καὶ κύων·
ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀπίδῃ τὸ θηρίον ἀπὸ τοῦ δενδρέου, τοξεύσας ἐπιβὰς

---

21. 1. **ποταμὸν διαβάντι.** To cross the Palus is not thought of; but we learn incidentally that the territory yonder was occupied by the Sindi, c. 28 *infra*. The Tanais is the Don, c. 57 *infra*.

2. **Σαυροματέων.** See *infra* cc. 110 ff. Fifteen days' journey is given as the measure of their territory.

5. **Βουδῖνοι.** See *infra* c. 108. No measure is given for the journey through their territory.

6. **ὕλῃ παντοίῃ.** Oak, white beech, and further north birch, juniper and pine are given by modern authorities as the prominent trees of the woodland.

22. 3. **ἀποκλίνοντι.** The traveller who has hitherto been moving, hypothetically, northward, is here supposed to incline in a north-easterly direction. This conception may very probably correspond to the direction of an ancient trade-route in those parts.

4. **Θυσσαγέται.** R. interprets "Lesser Getae" in contrast with "Massagetae" or "Greater Getae." Stein compares *Μυργέται, Τυραγέται.* The Thyssagetae are mentioned again, c. 123. Of the Iurki we hear no more. Their method of hunting, with trained horse and hound, is far from primitive: it is unfortunate that Hdt. does not specify the wild animals hunted. Though the measure of the desert journey is given no estimate is added for the territory of these tribes. In the Scythian settlement beyond the Iurki it is natural to suspect rather a remnant left behind on the migration S. or S.W., than a band of emigrants from the W. or S.W., if indeed any positive value is to be attached to so vague an authority. No account, it may be observed, of the *ἀπόστασις* is recorded.

10. **ἐπιβάς.** Holder reads *καὶ ἐπιβὰς* after *β.*

ἐπὶ τὸν ἵππον διώκει, καὶ ὁ κύων ἔχεται. ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ ἀποκλίνοντι οἰκέουσι Σκύθαι ἄλλοι, ἀπὸ τῶν βασιληίων Σκυθέων ἀποστάντες καὶ οὕτω ἀπικόμενοι ἐς τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον.

23 Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τῆς τούτων τῶν Σκυθέων χώρης ἐστὶ ἡ καταλεχθεῖσα πᾶσα πεδιάς τε γῆ καὶ βαθύγαιος, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τούτου λιθώδης τ' ἐστὶ καὶ τρηχέα. διεξελθόντι δὲ καὶ τῆς τρηχέης χώρης πολλὸν οἰκέουσι ὑπώρεαν ὀρέων ὑψηλῶν ἄνθρωποι λεγόμενοι εἶναι πάντες φαλακροὶ ἐκ γενετῆς γινόμενοι, καὶ ἔρσενες καὶ θήλεαι ὁμοίως, καὶ σιμοὶ καὶ γένεια ἔχοντες μεγάλα, φωνὴν δὲ ἰδίην ἱέντες, ἐσθῆτι δὲ χρεώμενοι Σκυθικῇ, ζῶντες δὲ ἀπὸ δενδρέων. ποντικὸν μὲν οὔνομα τῷ δενδρέῳ ἀπ' οὗ ζῶσι, μέγαθος δὲ κατὰ συκέην μάλιστά κῃ· καρπὸν δὲ φορέει κυάμῳ ἴσον, πυρῆνα δὲ ἔχει. τοῦτο ἐπεὰν γένηται πέπον, σακκέουσι ἱματίοισι, ἀπορρέει δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παχὺ καὶ μέλαν· οὔνομα δὲ τῷ ἀπορρέοντί ἐστι ἄσχυ· τοῦτο καὶ λείχουσι καὶ γάλακτι συμμίσγοντες πίνουσι, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς παχύτητος αὐτοῦ τῆς τρυγὸς παλάθας συντιθεῖσι καὶ ταύτας σιτέονται. πρόβατα γάρ σφι οὐ πολλά ἐστι· οὐ γάρ τι σπουδαῖαι αἱ νομαὶ αὐτόθι εἰσί. ὑπὸ

---

23. 4. ἄνθρωποι κτλ. In the hairless snub-nosed tribe, the Argippaei, described in this passage, one is tempted to see a Mongolian type of Central Asia. The food described answers to a species of cherry, still used and prepared by the Kalmucks; but the similarity of food does not justify an inference to an identity of race, and the length of their chins, or beards, and the sanctity of their morals are puzzling characteristics in the Argippaei. Perhaps a negative has dropped out, and we should read *γένεια ἔχοντες οὐ μεγάλα*, but in any case we seem to be approaching the neighbourhood of the idealised Hyperboreans; or to be in sight of a substitute for them.

The high mountains here mentioned Rawlinson identifies with those mentioned c. 25 *infra*, and both with the Ural; and he places the Argippaei to the east and the Issedones to the west of the Ural mountains. Herodotus, however, in c. 25 clearly places the Issedones to the east of the Argippaei, and puts no mountains between them. He is, moreover, moving from south to north when he encounters these mountains which bar further progress and knowledge; the mountains therefore he conceives as running E. and W. This would suit the Altai (with which Heeren identified the mountains mentioned in c. 25), better than the Ural. But it seems an error to attempt any such identifications in these outlying and misty regions of Hdt.'s geography. It is of course possible that some vague rumour of a great chain of mountains N.E. of Scythia carried to Hdt. should refer to the nearer chain of the Ural, but all accurate perspective and orientation have disappeared, and it is not impossible that these mountains in the extreme N.E. of (Herodotean) Europe are an imaginary set-off to the mountains in the extreme W. of Libya, c. 184 *infra*. If the river Araxes in c. 11 were correctly identified with the Wolga (by Rawlinson) and a knowledge of that river ascribed to Hdt., it is strange that the Araxes-Wolga is not encountered upon this journey from the Tanais (Don) to the (Ural) mountains. These mountains, be it remarked, are not of an imposing elevation, rarely rising above 5000 ft., and though ranging N. and S. for a distance of 1200 miles, they sink at their southern extremity gradually to the plain, and leave a wide gap towards the Caspian.

δενδρέῳ δὲ ἕκαστος κατοίκηται, τὸν μὲν χειμῶνα ἐπεὰν τὸ δένδρεον περικαλύψῃ πίλῳ στεγνῷ λευκῷ, τὸ δὲ θέρος ἄνευ πίλου. τούτους οὐδεὶς ἀδικέει ἀνθρώπων· ἱροὶ γὰρ λέγονται εἶναι· οὐδέ τι ἀρήιον ὅπλον ἐκτέαται. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τοῖσι περιοικέουσι οὗτοι εἰσὶ οἱ τὰς διαφορὰς διαιρέοντες, τοῦτο δὲ ὃς ἂν φεύγων καταφύγῃ ἐς τούτους, ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀδικέεται. οὔνομα δέ σφί ἐστι Ἀργιππαῖοι.

Μέχρι μέν νυν τῶν φαλακρῶν τούτων πολλὴ περιφανείη 24
τῆς χώρης ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἔμπροσθε ἐθνέων· καὶ γὰρ Σκυθέων τινὲς
ἀπικνέονται ἐς αὐτούς, τῶν οὐ χαλεπόν ἐστι πυθέσθαι καὶ
Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐκ Βορυσθένεός τε ἐμπορίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων
Ποντικῶν ἐμπορίων· Σκυθέων δὲ οἳ ἂν ἔλθωσι ἐς αὐτούς, δι'
ἑπτὰ ἑρμηνέων καὶ δι' ἑπτὰ γλωσσέων διαπρήσσονται. μέχρι 25
μὲν δὴ τούτων γινώσκεται, τὸ δὲ τῶν φαλακρῶν κατύπερθε οὐδεὶς
ἀτρεκέως οἶδε φράσαι. ὄρεα γὰρ ὑψηλὰ ἀποτάμνει ἄβατα καὶ
οὐδείς σφεα ὑπερβαίνει. οἱ δὲ φαλακροὶ οὗτοι λέγουσι, ἐμοὶ μὲν
οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, οἰκέειν τὰ ὄρεα αἰγίποδας ἄνδρας, ὑπερβάντι
δὲ τούτους ἀνθρώπους ἄλλους οἳ τὴν ἑξάμηνον κατεύδουσι.
τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἠῶ τῶν
φαλακρῶν γινώσκεται ἀτρεκέως ὑπὸ Ἰσσηδόνων οἰκεόμενον, τὸ
μέντοι κατύπερθε πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον οὐ γινώσκεται οὔτε τῶν
φαλακρῶν οὔτε τῶν Ἰσσηδόνων, εἰ μὴ ὅσα αὐτῶν τούτων λεγόντων.
νόμοισι δὲ Ἰσσηδόνες τοισίδε λέγονται χρᾶσθαι. ἐπεὰν ἀνδρὶ 26

---

24. 2. **καὶ γάρ.** We have here again a pause in which the sources of Hdt.'s information are reviewed. These author's notes (cc. 24-27) on his sources advertise the mythical character of the tribes enumerated on the authority of the Issedones: the existence of the Issedones is, however, guaranteed, probably on the authority of Aristeas, c. 13. Some of Hdt.'s information, whether oral or written, comes down, as appears from this passage, through Greeks of Olbia or other mercantile colonies, who owe their knowledge to Scythian travellers, who have to employ interpreters to the number of seven on their way between Olbia and the Argippaei.

3. **τῶν . . πυθέσθαι.** There is nothing in this passage to prove that Hdt. ever set foot in Olbia; or will it be contended that he visited 'all the other Pontic emporia'? Nor even to prove that his statements are based simply on oral information. See Introduction, § 20.

6. **ἑπτά.** How the number seven is arrived at is not easy to see. Rawlinson includes Scythian, for which Scyths would require no interpreter.

25. 3. **ὄρεα ὑψηλά.** The same as mentioned before c. 23, on the skirts (*ὑπώρεα*) of which dwell the Argippaei.

5. **αἰγίποδας.** There seems nothing incredible in the statement, rightly understood, that 'goat-footed' men dwelt on the mountains: it is even curious that Hdt. himself should not have 'rationalised' the phrase; cp. c. 31 *infra*.

6. **ἑξάμηνον.** In this statement, so utterly incredible to Hdt. in his ignorance of the sphericity of the earth (cp. c. 42 *infra*), it is natural to see a distorted tradition of the long polar winter; as in the Homeric account of Laistrygonia (*Od.* 10. 82-86) a dim notion of the midnight sun may be enveloped.

10. **εἰ μὴ ὅσα.** *γινώσκεται* subauditur.

26. 1. **νόμοισι.** The savage custom here described as practised by the Issedones

ἀποθάνῃ πατήρ, οἱ προσήκοντες πάντες προσάγουσι πρόβατα, καὶ ἔπειτα ταῦτα θύσαντες καὶ καταταμόντες τὰ κρέα κατατάμνουσι καὶ τὸν τοῦ δεκομένου τεθνεῶτα γονέα, ἀναμίξαντες δὲ πάντα τὰ κρέα δαῖτα προτίθενται· τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ψιλώσαντες καὶ ἐκκαθήραντες καταχρυσοῦσι καὶ ἔπειτα ἅτε ἀγάλματι χρέωνται, θυσίας μεγάλας ἐπετείους ἐπιτελέοντες. παῖς δὲ πατρὶ τοῦτο ποιέει, κατά περ Ἕλληνες τὰ γενέσια. ἄλλως δὲ δίκαιοι καὶ οὗτοι λέγονται εἶναι, ἰσοκρατέες δὲ ὁμοίως
27 αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖσι ἀνδράσι. γινώσκονται μὲν δὴ καὶ οὗτοι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων τὸ κατύπερθε Ἰσσηδόνες εἰσὶ οἱ λέγοντες μουνοφθάλμους ἀνθρώπους καὶ χρυσοφύλακας γρῦπας εἶναι· παρὰ δὲ τούτων Σκύθαι παραλαβόντες λέγουσι, παρὰ δὲ Σκυθέων ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄλλοι νενομίκαμεν καὶ ὀνομάζομεν αὐτοὺς σκυθιστὶ Ἀριμασπούς· ἄριμα γὰρ ἓν καλέουσι Σκύθαι, σποῦ δὲ ὀφθαλμόν.

28 Δυσχείμερος δὲ αὕτη ἡ καταλεχθεῖσα πᾶσα χώρη οὕτω δή τί

---

is not without parallels: 1. 216 of the Massagetae, 3. 38 of the Kallatiae, 3. 99 of the Padaei; and on the subject of such feasts of—and on—the dead, see J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* ii. 89, "It is now easy to understand why a savage should desire to partake of the flesh of an animal or man whom he regards as divine. By eating the body of the god he shares in the god's attributes and powers." The Hyperboreans (cp. c. 32 *infra*) were said by Hellanikos to destroy sexagenarians.

7. **ἀγάλματι.** Not 'ornament' (Schweig. and Rawlinson), but 'object of reverence,' almost 'fetish.'

8. **παῖς πατρὶ** and *πατὴρ supra* might lead to the inference that the Issedones were in the patriarchal status, which is hardly borne out by the position assigned to women, the latter rather pointing to a matriarchal society, or gynaecocracy.

τὰ γενέσια. A birthday festival in honour of the dead; *τὰ γενέθλια* in honour of the living: but the distinction is not always rigidly observed, cp. L. & S. *sub vocab.* (*νεκύσια* on the anniversary of death).

9. **καὶ οὗτοι.** As well as the Argippaei.

27. 2. **οἱ λέγοντες.** Stein explains as referring back to the *Arimaspeia* of Aristeas (c. 16 *supra* where the Issedones are expressly given as the poet's authority). The passage however before us here seems to trace the common Greek rumour (*ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄλλοι*) through the Scyths to the Issedones, cp. c. 32 *infra*. For the formula cp. c. 43 *infra*.

6. **ἄριμα γάρ.** Rawlinson recognises the scientific character of this philological excursus and admits *arima* and *spu* as two genuine Scythic words the meanings of which are certainly known. Eustathios and the Scholiast to Aischylos, *Prom.* 804, *ἀρὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἓν σκυθιστί, μασπὸς δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός* (*apud* Stein). Neumann, *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*, p. 195, explains the word by the Finnish vuozin-maa 'Bergland,' Highland; and supposes that Aristeas had called them figuratively Kyklopes, and that Herodotus (and of course Aischylos) took the trope for a translation, and so on. Other philologists have other etymologies. We seem to be in the region of etymological speculation, which "is apt to be misleading" (Rawlinson, iii. p. 5, n.[3]). Cp. Appendix I.

28. 1. **δυσχείμερος.** From such marvels as one-eyed men and griffins Hdt. glides to the portentous climate of Scythia and the European north-east. Scythia supplied the place in the ancient imagination filled by Siberia in ours. Ovid, *ex Ponto* 1, 3, 37 Scythico quid frigore peius? Hippokrates, *de Aere* 95 (quoted by Stein as 19), describes it. The Herodotaean description does not appear to be a gross exaggeration, but lacks discrimination. Rawlinson (note[8] *ad l.*) supposes a change in the climate for the better in modern times; but the trade and products of the

ἐστι, ἔνθα τοὺς μὲν ὀκτὼ τῶν μηνῶν ἀφόρητος οἷος γίνεται κρυμός, ἐν τοῖσι ὕδωρ ἐκχέας πηλὸν οὐ ποιήσεις, πῦρ δὲ ἀνακαίων ποιήσεις [πηλόν]· ἡ δὲ θάλασσα πήγνυται καὶ ὁ Βόσπορος πᾶς ὁ Κιμμέριος, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κρυστάλλου οἱ ἐντὸς τάφρου Σκύθαι κατοικημένοι στρατεύονται καὶ τὰς ἁμάξας ἐπελαύνουσι πέρην ἐς τοὺς Σίνδους. οὕτω μὲν δὴ τοὺς ὀκτὼ μῆνας διατελέει χειμὼν ἐών, τοὺς δ' ἐπιλοίπους τέσσερας ψύχεα αὐτόθι ἐστί. κεχώρισται δὲ οὗτος ὁ χειμὼν τοὺς τρόπους πᾶσι τοῖσι ἐν ἄλλοισι χωρίοισι γινομένοισι χειμῶσι, ἐν τῷ τὴν μὲν ὡραίην οὐκ ὕει λόγου ἄξιον οὐδέν, τὸ δὲ θέρος ὕων οὐκ ἀνιεῖ· βρονταί τε ἦμος τῇ ἄλλῃ γίνονται, τηνικαῦτα μὲν οὐ γίνονται, θέρεος δὲ ἀμφιλαφέες· ἢν δὲ χειμῶνος βροντὴ γένηται, ὡς τέρας νενόμισται θωμάζεσθαι. ὣς δὲ καὶ ἢν σεισμὸς γένηται ἤν τε θέρεος ἤν τε χειμῶνος ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ, τέρας νενόμισται. ἵπποι δὲ ἀνεχόμενοι φέρουσι τὸν χειμῶνα τοῦτον, ἡμίονοι δὲ οὐδὲ ὄνοι οὐκ ἀνέχονται ἀρχήν· τῇ δὲ ἄλλῃ ἵπποι μὲν ἐν κρυμῷ ἑστεῶτες ἀποσφακελίζουσι, ὄνοι δὲ καὶ ἡμίονοι ἀνέχονται.

29 δοκέει δέ μοι καὶ τὸ γένος τῶν βοῶν τὸ κόλον διὰ ταῦτα οὐ φύειν κέρεα αὐτόθι· μαρτυρέει δέ μοι τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ Ὁμήρου ἔπος ἐν Ὀδυσσείῃ ἔχον ὧδε,

καὶ Λιβύην, ὅθι τ' ἄρνες ἄφαρ κεραοὶ τελέθουσι,

ὀρθῶς εἰρημένον, ἐν τοῖσι θερμοῖσι ταχὺ παραγίνεσθαι τὰ κέρεα,

---

district mentioned by Hdt. himself seem to show that the eight months of winter and four months of cold are an overstatement. Hdt. is not speaking from personal experience. "The summer is now intensely hot" R. And it was in antiquity likewise. Cp. Aristot. *Prob.* 25, 6, Strabo, p. 307 (quoted by St.); see further, Stanford's *Europe*, p. 185. Blakesley says that the extension of the winter to eight months is "due entirely to the circumstance that the commercial season lasted only four." But why should the commercial season have lasted only four months, if six or more had been available?

4. **ἡ δὲ θάλασσα.** "The sea freezes to a considerable distance from the shore" R. *θάλασσα* need not be confined to the Palus, but covers the salt water outside.

6. **στρατεύονται.** Not necessarily 'warlike expeditions.' R. "Pass in hosts across," "in Schaaren ziehen" (Stein).

τὰς ἁμάξας. Drawn by oxen, cp. cc. 69 *infra* and 29 *infra*.

Σίνδους. An undesigned but valuable addition to the geography of c. 21 *supra*, supplying us with the tribe east of the Palus and south of the Sauromatae. c. 86 *infra* their territory is named *ἡ Σινδική*.

14. **ἐν τ. Σ. τέρας** cannot be taken to mean that earthquakes were not regarded as portentous in Hellas. The words *ἐν τ. Σκ.* are perhaps misplaced, and might better follow the previous *ἢν δὲ χειμῶνος*.

29. 2. **κέρεα.** Hdt.'s speculation on the effects of the cold is not altogether happy; elk and reindeer refute it (*vide* Rawlinson). But these cases are unknown to him. His remark on the ass seems questionable. Cp. Burton's *Pilgrimage to Mecca* iii. 339, n. It is more important to observe that we see here a recognition of physical causation, and of a relation between fauna and environment, which is one of the beginnings of science, as contrasted with mere astonishment or superstition.

3. **Ὀδυσσείῃ.** 4. 85.

ἐν δὲ τοῖσι ἰσχυροῖσι ψύχεσι ἢ οὐ φύειν κέρεα τὰ κτήνεα ἀρχὴν ἢ φύοντα φύειν μόγις.

30 Ἐνθαῦτα μέν νυν διὰ τὰ ψύχεα γίνεται ταῦτα. θωμάζω δὲ (προσθήκας γὰρ δή μοι ὁ λόγος ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐδίζητο) ὅτι ἐν τῇ Ἠλείῃ πάσῃ χώρῃ οὐ δυνέαται γίνεσθαι ἡμίονοι, οὔτε ψυχροῦ τοῦ χώρου ἐόντος οὔτε ἄλλου φανεροῦ αἰτίου οὐδενός. φασὶ δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἠλεῖοι ἐκ κατάρης τευ οὐ γίνεσθαι σφίσι ἡμιόνους, ἀλλ' ἐπεὰν προσίῃ ἡ ὥρη κυΐσκεσθαι τὰς ἵππους, ἐξελαύνουσι ἐς τοὺς πλησιοχώρους αὐτάς, καὶ ἔπειτά σφι ἐν τῇ τῶν πέλας ἐπιεῖσι τοὺς ὄνους, ἐς οὗ ἂν σχῶσι αἱ ἵπποι ἐν γαστρί· ἔπειτα δὲ ἀπελαύνουσι.

31 Περὶ δὲ τῶν πτερῶν τῶν Σκύθαι λέγουσι ἀνάπλεον εἶναι τὸν ἠέρα, καὶ τούτων εἵνεκα οὐκ οἷοί τε εἶναι οὔτε ἰδεῖν τὸ πρόσω τῆς ἠπείρου οὔτε διεξιέναι, τήνδε ἔχω περὶ αὐτῶν γνώμην· τὰ κατύπερθε ταύτης τῆς χώρης αἰεὶ νίφεται, ἐλάσσονι δὲ τοῦ θέρεος ἢ τοῦ χειμῶνος, ὥσπερ καὶ οἰκός. ἤδη ὦν ὅστις ἀγχόθεν χιόνα ἁδρὴν πίπτουσαν εἶδε, οἶδε τὸ λέγω· ἔοικε γὰρ ἡ χιὼν πτεροῖσι· καὶ διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα τοῦτον ἐόντα τοιοῦτον ἀνοίκητα τὰ πρὸς

---

30. 2. προσθήκας . . ἐδίζητο. A passage that has been too generally taken as raising the whole problem of the times, places, and methods of composition betrayed by the work of Herodotus, as if this passage must needs have been an *additum* to the 'first edition' or draught of the whole work (cp. 7. 171). But the λόγος here specified is not the whole work, but is the λόγος about Scythia, cp. c. 16 *supra*; and the ἀρχή is the ἀρχή referred to in c. 82 *infra*. To speak of this short note as an addition to the whole work would be out of all proportion.

There is, in any case, nothing here to prove that this passage was "added at Thurii" (R.). Supposing indeed that Hdt. gleaned his facts at Elis, he may have touched there going, or returning, between Athens and the West, cp. c. 195 *infra*; or he may have visited Elis from Sparta (3. 55); or he may have visited Elis at some other time for an Olympiad; or he may never have visited Elis at all: for the mere formula φασὶ δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἠλεῖοι does not prove that Herodotus was ever in Elis, or even that he ever discussed the matter with men of Elis. Cp. Introduction, §§ 20, 21.

6. ἐξελαύνουσι κτλ. Of this fact there need be no doubt as it is vouched further by Pausan. 5. 5, 2, Plutarch, *Mor.* 303, and is not without parallels, *e.g.* the case of the women of Delos (Thuc. 3. 104, 2) and an Alsatian legend, quoted by Stein, connected with the story of S. Deodatus: from *Zeitsch. f. d. Philol.* iii. 337. That the immediate reason of the custom was a religious one need not be doubted, though the design may have been to encourage horse-breeding (consult Plutarch, *l.c.*). Hdt. however being in the vein for physical explanations apparently discredits the Elean account without hitting upon the sufficiently obvious economic reason.

31. 5. ὅστις κτλ. It appears that Hdt. has in his mind readers, or hearers, who had never seen a heavy fall of snow close by; who had never been out of doors in a snow shower. This condition may have been realised by some fine gentlemen in Hellas from Sicily to Cyprus, from Athens to Naukratis; but, as ὅστις is feminine as well as masculine, it may include here the fair sex, among whose ranks Hdt. even in his own day may have numbered many admirers.

7. ἀνοίκητα. The extreme north is thus in Hdt.'s opinion rendered uninhabitable by the cold just as the extreme south by the heat. He would have smiled to hear that the south was as cold as the north. Cp. c. 36 *infra*.

βορέην ἐστι τῆς ἠπείρου ταύτης. τὰ ὦν πτερὰ εἰκάζοντας τὴν χιόνα τοὺς Σκύθας τε καὶ τοὺς περιοίκους δοκέω λέγειν. ταῦτα μέν νυν τὰ λέγεται μακρότατα εἴρηται.

Ὑπερβορέων δὲ πέρι ἀνθρώπων οὔτε τι Σκύθαι λέγουσι 32 οὐδὲν οὔτε τινὲς ἄλλοι τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων, εἰ μὴ ἄρα Ἰσσηδόνες. ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ δοκέω, οὐδ' οὗτοι λέγουσι οὐδέν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ἂν καὶ Σκύθαι, ὡς περὶ τῶν μουνοφθάλμων λέγουσι. ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδῳ μέν ἐστι περὶ Ὑπερβορέων εἰρημένα, ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ ἐν Ἐπιγόνοισι, εἰ δὴ τῷ ἐόντι γε Ὅμηρος ταῦτα τὰ ἔπεα ἐποίησε. πολλῷ δέ τι πλεῖστα περὶ αὐτῶν Δήλιοι λέγουσι, 33

---

8. The concluding words *τὰ ὦν πτερὰ . . λέγειν* are a crux to the translators. "And the Scythians, with their neighbours, call the snowflakes feathers because, I think, of the likeness which they bear to them" Rawlinson. "The feathers then is a name which the Scythians, in my opinion, give to the snow, indicating the similarity" Blakesley. The following version might do: "In speaking of (the) feathers the Scyths and their neighbours are in my opinion speaking of the snow under a figure." Larcher *ad l.* cites Psalm 147. 5 dat nivem sicut lanam. (Mr. Macaulay translates: "I think therefore that by the feathers the Scythians and those who dwell near them mean symbolically the snow.")

9. **περιοίκους**, *sc.* *πλησιοχώρους* (c. 33 *infra et al.*).

32. 4. **ἀλλά.** Blakesley endorses Wolf's suspicion that the sentence *ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδῳ —ἐποίησε* is the insertion of a late grammarian. If that were so the following sentence *πολλῷ δὲ κτλ.* would be an inconsequence (as if Hdt. wrote—"The Scythians say nothing, but the Delians say most" !).

5. **Ἡσιόδῳ.** Perhaps in the lost work *Γῆς περίοδος*. Stein however argues that as Hdt. does not name the work there must have been a Hesiodic poem specially on the Hyperboreans.

6. **Ὁμήρῳ.** Hdt. questions the Homeric authorship of the *Epigoni* as in 2. 117 of the *Cypria*. Mahaffy, *G.L.* i.[2] 67, sees in this scepticism the result of "the critical labours of the commission of Peisistratus" (cp. Bergk, *Gr. L.* i. 508). The *Epigoni*, a poem belonging to the Theban cycle, he ascribes to Antimachos of Teos (cp. Bergk, ii. p. 42). It was a poem of 7000 lines of which only one has come down to us, not concerning the Hyperboreans. To the Homeric pseudepigrapha containing allusion to Hyperboreans is to be added *Hym.* 6. 28 *ἔλπομαι ἢ Αἴγυπτον ἀφίξεται ἢ ὅγε Κύπρον | ἢ ἐς Ὑπερβορέους ἢ ἑκαστέρω* (ed. Gemoll. p. 80). And to the poetical authorities might have been added Pindar, *Ol.* 3. 16 (where the Hyperboreans seem to be located about the Danube), *Pyth.* 10. 30, *Isth.* 5. (6.) 23, *Frag.* 257 (156), and Aischylos, *Choeph.* 365.

Hdt. does not here expressly refer to the *Arimaspeia* of Aristeas, though the potential exception in favour of the Issedones is presumably due to the utilisation of their authority in that poem (cc. 13, 16 *supra*). Niebuhr (*Geography of Hdt.* p. 6) regarded Hdt.'s disquisition on the Hyperboreans as a polemic against Hekataios: but the passage in Diodoros 2. 47 is now generally ascribed to Hekataios of Abdera. The elder Hekataios, however, had presumably mentioned the Hyperboreans, and it is a curious coincidence that the passage in Diodoros adds a tradition about Abaris (c. 36 *infra*). The traditions in Hesiod and 'Homer' (*Epigoni*) probably reproduced the Delphic version of the Hyperborean myth, to which Herodotus evidently prefers the Delian.

33. 1. **Δήλιοι.** The Delian myth of the Hyperboreans (cc. 33-35). Whatever else we have in this legend we seem to have an indication of a great trade-route from the north to the religious and commercial centre of the Ionians of early times (cp. Thuc. 3. 104) in the Aegean sea. Some of the stations on this route are indicated. It goes back from Delos to Tenos, Karystos, up through Euboean waters (the Euripos) to Malis: from Malis overland to Dodona: northward again along the

φάμενοι ἱρὰ ἐνδεδεμένα ἐν καλάμῃ πυρῶν ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων φερόμενα ἀπικνέεσθαι ἐς Σκύθας, ἀπὸ δὲ Σκυθέων ἤδη δεκομένους αἰεὶ τοὺς πλησιοχώρους ἑκάστους κομίζειν αὐτὰ τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης ἑκαστάτω ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδρίην, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ πρὸς μεσαμβρίην προπεμπόμενα πρώτους Δωδωναίους Ἑλλήνων δέκεσθαι, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων καταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸν Μηλιέα κόλπον καὶ διαπορεύεσθαι ἐς Εὔβοιαν, πόλιν τε ἐς πόλιν πέμπειν μέχρι Καρύστου, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐκλιπεῖν Ἄνδρον· Καρυστίους γὰρ εἶναι τοὺς κομίζοντας ἐς Τῆνον, Τηνίους δὲ ἐς Δῆλον. ἀπικνέεσθαι μέν νυν οὕτω ταῦτα τὰ ἱρὰ λέγουσι ἐς Δῆλον· πρῶτον δὲ τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους πέμψαι φερούσας τὰ ἱρὰ δύο κόρας, τὰς ὀνομάζουσι Δήλιοι εἶναι Ὑπερόχην τε καὶ Λαοδίκην· ἅμα δὲ αὐτῇσι

Adriatic coast. A route connects the head of the Adriatic with 'Scythia.' Thence the journey fades away to the north. It was along this line, or along these lines, probably, that the great amber trade was conducted from the Eastern (Baltic) source. But of stations north of Adria no hint has reached Herodotus, or his informants: and it may be doubted whether there is not underlying the saga an unconscious confusion between two routes, from the Baltic to the southern sea, one reaching its waters in the Adriatic, the other in the Pontos. (On the amber trade and its routes see F. Waldmann, *Der Bernstein im Alterthum*, Fellin. 1883.) Whether Phoenicians and 'Karians' (cp. Thuc. 1. 4, 8) preceded Ionians in the occupation of Delos or not, probably this trade between Delos and the Baltic dates from times long before Ionian and Hellenic occupation. We therefore need not see in the story (with Attinger, *Delos*, 1887) any memorial of the Hellenic invasion of Delos from the north.

Kallimachos, *Hymn. Del.* 283 ff. (ed. Meineke), is presumably indebted to Herodotus for the stations mentioned on the route. Pausan. 1. 31, 2 (77) follows a different tradition, according to which the offerings from the Hyperboreans pass to the Arimaspi, Issedones, Scyths; are conveyed by the Scyths to Sinope, and from Sinope to Attica, to the temple of Apollo at Prasiae: the Athenians pass them on to Delos. This story Rawlinson discredits as an invention of Athenian vanity: Crusius (Roscher's *Lexikon*, 2820) traces it to Phanodemos and recognises its Athenian motive. It is on the face of it less primitive than the other, but of course utilises real facts and trading stations. Schubart's emendation, Δωδώνην for Σινώπην, may be dismissed, with Crusius, as a mistaken effort to harmonise Pausanias (Phanodemos) and Herodotus, *inter alia* because it establishes a connexion between the Hyperborean myth and the cult of Apollo, and deduces the former from the latter. See the admirable article by Crusius in Roscher's *Lexikon*, *sub voc.* HYPERBOREER.

6. **Δωδωναίους.** Etym. M. *sub v.*

9. **Ἄνδρον.** This boycotting of Andros by its nearest neighbours, Karystos and Tenos, may have been due to commercial or to religious rivalry. Andros was connected by its colonies Akanthos, Sane, Stageiros, Argilos, with Thrace, and specially addicted to the cult of Dionysos. It pursued at times an independent policy, cp. 8. 111.

11. **λέγουσι.** We here tap one of Hdt.'s sources. That he visited Delos is morally certain (6. 98 *infra*). Introduction, § 21. The Delians probably got their information out of their hymn-books. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxiv.

12. **δύο κόρας.** There was a certain dualism in the cult at Delos which dated back to the prae-Hellenic days (Hirschfeld, *Deutsche Rundschau*, Oct. 1884), but the sex of the divinities was different as with Apollo-Artemis. The virgins here, like the still more primitive pair c. 35 *infra*, seem to be Hellenic personifications, or aspects of Artemis.

13. **Ὑπερόχη**, praestans, eminens. **Λαοδίκη**, populi jus: Baehr.

ἀσφαλείης εἵνεκεν πέμψαι τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους τῶν ἀστῶν ἄνδρας
πέντε πομπούς, τούτους οἳ νῦν Περφερέες καλέονται τιμὰς μεγά-
λας ἐν Δήλῳ ἔχοντες. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖσι Ὑπερβορέοισι τοὺς ἀπο-
πεμφθέντας ὀπίσω οὐκ ἀπονοστέειν, δεινὰ ποιευμένους εἴ σφέας
αἰεὶ καταλάμψεται ἀποστέλλοντας μὴ ἀποδέκεσθαι, οὕτω δὴ
φέροντας ἐς τοὺς οὔρους τὰ ἱρὰ ἐνδεδεμένα ἐν πυρῶν καλάμῃ
τοὺς πλησιοχώρους ἐπισκήπτειν κελεύοντας προπέμπειν σφέα
ἀπὸ ἑωυτῶν ἐς ἄλλο ἔθνος. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω προπεμπόμενα
ἀπικνέεσθαι λέγουσι ἐς Δῆλον. οἶδα δὲ αὐτὸς τούτοισι τοῖσι
ἱροῖσι τόδε ποιεύμενον προσφερές, τὰς Θρηικίας καὶ τὰς Παιονί-
δας γυναῖκας, ἐπεὰν θύωσι τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ βασιλείῃ, οὐκ ἄνευ
πυρῶν καλάμης ἐχούσας τὰ ἱρά. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταύτας οἶδα 34
ποιεύσας· τῇσι δὲ παρθένοισι ταύτῃσι τῇσι ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων
τελευτησάσῃσι ἐν Δήλῳ κείρονται καὶ αἱ κόραι καὶ οἱ παῖδες
οἱ Δηλίων· αἱ μὲν πρὸ γάμου πλόκαμον ἀποταμνόμεναι καὶ
περὶ ἄτρακτον εἱλίξασαι ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα τιθεῖσι (τὸ δὲ σῆμά ἐστι
ἔσω ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπιπέφυκε δέ
οἱ ἐλαίη), ὅσοι δὲ παῖδες τῶν Δηλίων, περὶ χλόην τινὰ εἱλίξαντες
τῶν τριχῶν τιθεῖσι καὶ οὗτοι ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα. αὗται μὲν δὴ ταύτην 35
τιμὴν ἔχουσι πρὸς τῶν Δήλου οἰκητόρων. φασὶ δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ
οὗτοι καὶ τὴν Ἄργην τε καὶ τὴν Ὦπιν ἐούσας παρθένους ἐξ
Ὑπερβορέων κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τούτους ἀνθρώπους πορευομένας
ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Δῆλον ἔτι πρότερον Ὑπερόχης τε καὶ Λαοδίκης.

15. **Περφερέες**· *θεωροί* Hesych. According to some etymologists this word contains the key to the mystery. Περφερέες = ὑπερφερέτης or ὑπέρφοροι, the 'Bringers of the offering.' ὑπέρφοροι becomes ὑπέρβοροι. (Ὑπερβέρετος a spring month in Krete: Ὑπερβερεταῖος a harvest month in Macedonia.) A *Volksetymologie* connects the word with Boreas and creates a mythic land and people "beyond the north-wind" (Ahrens). This is to be preferred to G. Curtius' suggestion that Ὑπερβόρειοι = Ὑπερ(F)όρειοι, the men beyond the mountains (*ultramontani*).

19. **ἱρὰ . . πυρῶν** can only mean 'offerings tied up in wheaten straw.' What the offerings were is not here said clearly, but they may have consisted in or included firstfruits and offerings in kind. Pausanias 1. 31, 2 pragmatises, *τὰς δὲ ἀπαρχὰς κεκρύφθαι μὲν ἐν καλάμῃ πυρῶν γινώσκεσθαι δὲ ὑπ' οὐδένων*. In any case they were unbloody offerings, offered to Apollo as a god of agriculture.

22. **οἶδα κτλ.** seems to imply that he had not seen the straw in use at Delos. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxi.

34. 5. **τὸ δὲ σῆμα κτλ.** reads like the result of autopsy: as also the description of the *θήκη* c. 35 *infra*. Cp. Introduction, § 21 and *l.c. supra*.

35. 3. **Ἄργη** and **Ὦπις** may also be taken as epithets and duplicates of Artemis. For Arge Pausanias 5. 7, 8 (Pseudo-Platon, *Axioch.* 371 A) has Ἑκαέργη, an unmistakable title, which it has been proposed to substitute here: but ἄργος, swift or bright, is perfectly intelligible as applied to the moon-goddess, Ἄρτεμις ἡ Βασιληΐη, c. 33 *supra* (= Lucina, Stein). Ὦπις or Οὖπις is an epithet of Artemis Lucina as Eileithuia, Kallim. *Hymn. Del.* 204. Pseudo-P. *l.c.* Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* 3. 23, 58, represents Upis as the father of Diana, and adds: eam Graeci saepe Upim paterno nomine appellant. In Ps.-Plat. *l.c.* Ὦπις is perhaps masculine (*i.e.* not Artemis but Apollo).

ταύτας μέν νυν τῇ Εἰλειθυίῃ ἀποφερούσας ἀντὶ τοῦ ὠκυτόκου τὸν ἐτάξαντο φόρον ἀπικέσθαι, τὴν δὲ Ἄργην τε καὶ τὴν Ὦπιν ἅμα αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἀπικέσθαι λέγουσι καί σφι τιμὰς ἄλλας δεδόσθαι πρὸς σφέων· καὶ γὰρ ἀγείρειν σφι τὰς γυναῖκας ἐπονομαζούσας τὰ οὐνόματα ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ τόν σφι Ὠλὴν ἀνὴρ Λύκιος ἐποίησε, παρὰ δὲ σφέων μαθόντας νησιώτας τε καὶ Ἴωνας ὑμνέειν Ὦπίν τε καὶ Ἄργην ὀνομάζοντάς τε καὶ ἀγείροντας (οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ὠλὴν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὕμνους ἐποίησε ἐκ Λυκίης ἐλθὼν τοὺς ἀειδομένους ἐν Δήλῳ), καὶ τῶν μηρίων καταγιζομένων ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ τὴν σποδὸν ταύτην ἐπὶ τὴν θήκην τῆς Ὤπιός τε καὶ Ἄργης ἀναισιμοῦσθαι ἐπιβαλλομένην. ἡ δὲ θήκη αὐτέων ἐστὶ ὄπισθε τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου, πρὸς ἠῶ τετραμμένη, ἀγχοτάτω τοῦ Κηίων ἱστιητορίου.

36 Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ὑπερβορέων πέρι εἰρήσθω· τὸν γὰρ περὶ Ἀβάριος λόγον τοῦ λεγομένου εἶναι Ὑπερβορέου οὐ λέγω, [λέγων] ὡς τὸν ὀιστὸν περιέφερε κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν οὐδὲν σιτεό-

---

6. **τοῦ ὠκυτόκου.** "It is undoubtedly their own *ὠκυτοκία* that is intended" R. What must really be intended is the *ὠκυτοκία* of Leto, in the birth of Apollo and Artemis. Aristot. *Hist. Animal.* 6. 35. Pausan. 1. 18, 5.

7. **τὸν ἐτάξαντο φόρον** has a curiously official ring about it. One sees how easily religious precedent might be utilised for political purposes. (Cp. 3. 13 *φόρον τε ἐτάξαντο καὶ δῶρα ἔπεμπον*, and the rubric in the Athenian lists: *πόλεις αὐταὶ ταξάμεναι*, Hicks, No. 35, *C.I.A.* i. 244.)

8. **τοῖσι θεοῖσι.** Apollo and Artemis naturally suggested: but as they did not *come* to Delos (according to the Delian legend here presupposed) but were born there, we must consider earlier divinities to be here meant, though these earlier divinities are only Apollo and Artemis in earlier forms, perhaps Phoenician as distinguished from Hellenic. (Crusius, *op. cit.* 2811, understands it of "Eileithyia Leto and the twins.")

10. **Ὠλήν.** *Δυμαῖος ἢ Ὑπερβόρειος ἢ Λύκιος ἐποποιός· μᾶλλον δὲ Λύκιος ἀπὸ Ξάνθου ὡς δηλοῖ* Καλλίμαχος *καὶ ὁ* Πολυ*ίστωρ ἐν τοῖς περὶ Λυκίας*, Suidas. These variations were probably inferences from the internal evidences of his Hymns. Pausanias is our best authority, and explains the article in Suidas. Paus. *l.c. supra;* add 5. 7, 8, 8. 21, 3, and 9. 27. 2. A Delphic tradition represented Olen as a Hyperborean, and one of the founders of the oracle, and inventor of the hexameter, 10. 5, 7 f. See further, Mahaffy, *Gk. L.* i. 14, 15, Bergk, ii. 111, and Pauly, *R.-E. sub v.*

17. **πρὸς ἠῶ** seems to prove that this was a Carian or Phoenician tomb. Müller, *Dorians*, II. iv. 3, n.[3]

36. 2. **Ἀβάριος.** Cp. Harpokration, Suidas *sub v.* Where Hdt. heard or read the story of Abaris, which he rejects, he omits to mention; perhaps in Sparta, where the Hyperborean disputed with the Thracian Orpheus the honour of having founded a temple to *Κόρη Σωτεῖρα* Pausan. 3. 13, 2. (That he was worshipped in Sparta I cannot discover. Schreiber in Roscher's *Lexikon*, *sub v.*) Perhaps in Pindar's works, who made Abaris contemporary with Kroisos (*q.v.* Harpokration). Cp. Bentley, *Dissertations*, ed. Bohn, pp. 109, 110. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 313 f., assigns as a date for the verses circulated in his name *c.* Ol. 42=612-8 B.C. (cp. article in Pauly, *R.-E.* i.[2] p. 7). Neither is it obvious why Hdt., who admits the story of the ecstatic journey of Aristeas, should reject that of Abaris, unless it be that the one is a Greek and the other a Hyperborean.

3. **τὸν ὀιστόν.** Later tradition improved on this, and made the arrow carry Abaris. Iambl. *vita Pythag.* 19. 28: but perhaps we should boldly read here *ὀιστὸς* and *σιτεόμενον*.

μενος. εἰ δέ εἰσι ὑπερβόρεοί τινες ἄνθρωποι, εἰσὶ καὶ ὑπερνότιοι ἄλλοι. γελῶ δὲ ὁρέων γῆς περιόδους γράψαντας πολλοὺς ἤδη καὶ οὐδένα νοονεχόντως ἐξηγησάμενον· οἳ Ὠκεανόν τε ῥέοντα γράφουσι πέριξ τὴν γῆν ἐοῦσαν κυκλοτερέα ὡς ἀπὸ τόρνου, καὶ τὴν Ἀσίην τῇ Εὐρώπῃ ποιεύντων ἴσην. ἐν ὀλίγοισι γὰρ ἐγὼ δηλώσω μέγαθός τε ἑκάστης αὐτέων καὶ οἵη τίς ἐστι ἐς γραφὴν ἑκάστη.

Πέρσαι οἰκέουσι κατήκοντες ἐπὶ τὴν νοτίην θάλασσαν τὴν 37
Ἐρυθρὴν καλεομένην, τούτων δὲ ὑπεροικέουσι πρὸς βορέην
ἄνεμον Μῆδοι, Μήδων δὲ Σάσπειρες, Σασπείρων δὲ Κόλχοι
κατήκοντες ἐπὶ τὴν βορηίην θάλασσαν, ἐς τὴν Φᾶσις ποταμὸς
ἐκδιδοῖ. ταῦτα τέσσερα ἔθνεα οἰκέει ἐκ θαλάσσης ἐς θάλασσαν.
ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης ἀκταὶ διφάσιαι ἀπ' αὐτῆς κατα- 38

---

4. **εἰσὶ καί.** On principles of symmetry valid for Hdt. The intense heat of the south makes such an hypothesis inadmissible, and the argument is a *reductio ad absurdum.* A very powerful form of ratiocination, when the facts are correctly ascertained.

5. **γελῶ.** Herodotus' merriment at the expense of Hekataios and others his predecessors, though not altogether amiable, has fortunately led him to develop further his own geographical notions. Cp. 5. 49 ff. *infra.*

6. **νοονεχόντως.** An emendation by Stein (=*ἐμφρόνως*) upon Dobree's *νόον ἐχόντως.* The MSS. read *νόον ἔχοντας ἐξηγησάμενον.* Blakesley proposes *οὐδ' ἕνα νόον ἔχοντα* neut. pl. Baehr brackets *ἐξηγησάμενον* and reads *οὐδένα νόον ἔχοντας.* The MSS. reading is not unintelligible, taking the words in the following order: *καὶ ἔχοντας οὐδένα νόον ἐξηγησάμενον* (not, however, "to guide them" R., which would be *ἐξηγησόμενον*). *νοονεχόντως* is rather Platonic than Herodotean Greek.

7. **κυκλοτερέα ὡς ἀ. τ.** Would Hdt. have laughed, had he been acquainted with the idea that the earth was actually spherical? Or had this "Pythagorean" (Berger, *Geogr. d. Ionier*, p. 28) notion crossed him and reinforced his contempt for the science of the Ionians?

37. 1. **Πέρσαι.** Schweighäuser reads *Ἀσίην Πέρσαι κτλ.* Even so the transition is somewhat abrupt. *τὴν μὲν Ἀσίην* might be admitted (cp. *ἡ δὲ Λιβύη*, c. 41, after *τοιαύτη μέν*).

τὴν νοτίην θ. Here of course the Persian Gulf or Indian Ocean (*τ. Ἐρυθρὴν κ.* cp. 1. 1; Hdt. not making any distinction between them); while the northern sea is here the Pontos, cp. c. 13 *supra.*

The mention of the four nations (Persians, Medes, Saspeires, Kolchi) Blakesley, n. 116, explains as due to a commercial route. In 1. 104 the Saspeires are expressly said to be the only people between Media and Kolchis. In 3. 94 with the Matieni and Alarodii they make up the eighteenth satrapy. They may be located in Eastern Armenia, but cannot be identified. (Bunbury, *Anc. Geogr.* i. 245.) Their arms are described in 7. 79, where they appear in company with the Alarodians.

3. **Κόλχοι.** According to Hdt. 2. 104 of Egyptian origin, which, if anything more than a false inference from the evidence there adduced, may again be taken as indicating commercial relations (through Phoenicians ?).

There is no reason to doubt that Hdt. conceives these tribes in a line due north: he could signify N.W. if he wished to do so.

38. 1. **ἀκταὶ διφ.** L. & S. take of the N. and S. coasts of Asia Minor. Hdt.'s meaning is plain. One *ἀκτὴ* is made up of Asia Minor with thirty nations (c. 38), the other, as he conceives it, is made up of Persia, Assyria, and Arabia, containing only three nations (c. 39). *ἀκτὴ* as thus used by Hdt. seems to mean a process or elongation of the continent larger than a *χερσόνησος*, and perhaps without a clear isthmus. But see Baehr *ad l.*

ἀπ' αὐτῆς, *sc.* *Ἀσίης.*

τείνουσι ἐς θάλασσαν, τὰς ἐγὼ ἀπηγήσομαι· ἔνθεν μὲν ἡ ἀκτὴ ἡ ἑτέρη τὰ πρὸς βορέην ἀπὸ Φάσιος ἀρξαμένη παρατέταται ἐς θάλασσαν παρά τε τὸν Πόντον καὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον μέχρι Σιγείου τοῦ Τρωικοῦ· τὰ δὲ πρὸς νότου ἡ αὐτὴ αὕτη ἀκτὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Μυριανδικοῦ κόλπου τοῦ πρὸς Φοινίκῃ κειμένου τείνει τὰ ἐς θάλασσαν μέχρι Τριοπίου ἄκρης. οἰκέει δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκτῇ ταύτῃ

39 ἔθνεα ἀνθρώπων τριήκοντα. αὕτη μέν νυν ἡ ἑτέρη τῶν ἀκτέων, ἡ δὲ δὴ ἑτέρη ἀπὸ Περσέων ἀρξαμένη παρατέταται ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν, ἥ τε Περσικὴ καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐκδεκομένη ἡ Ἀσσυρίη καὶ ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίης ἡ Ἀραβίη· λήγει δὲ αὕτη, οὐ λήγουσα εἰ μὴ νόμῳ ἐς τὸν κόλπον τὸν Ἀράβιον, ἐς τὸν Δαρεῖος ἐκ τοῦ Νείλου διώρυχα ἐσήγαγε. μέχρι μέν νυν Φοινίκης ἀπὸ Περσέων χῶρος πλατὺς καὶ πολλός ἐστι· τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ Φοινίκης παρήκει διὰ τῆσδε τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀκτὴ αὕτη παρά τε Συρίην τὴν Παλαιστίνην καὶ Αἴγυπτον, ἐς τὴν τελευτᾷ· ἐν

40 τῇ ἔθνεά ἐστι τρία μοῦνα. ταῦτα μὲν ἀπὸ Περσέων τὰ πρὸς ἑσπέρην τῆς Ἀσίης ἔχοντά ἐστι· τὰ δὲ κατύπερθε Περσέων καὶ Μήδων καὶ Σασπείρων καὶ Κόλχων, τὰ πρὸς ἠῶ τε καὶ

---

3. **τὰ πρὸς β.** The north side of the first *ἀκτὴ* extends from the Phasis to Sigeion. Can it be that Hdt. places the Phasis too far south, and on the north-east corner of the peninsula? Sigeion is situated at the S. exit of the Hellespont, which, as Stein points out, includes here the Propontis and Bosporos (cp. 1. 57, 4. 76, 96, 138, 5. 103, 6. 26, 33, 7. 137).

5. **τὰ πρὸς νότου.** The south coast extends from the gulf of Myriandos to the Triopian promontory, S. of Halikarnassos.

8. **τριήκοντα.** It is possible to bring together 30 names from the list of satrapies 3. 90 or from the Army list 7. 72-80, 91-95, but the names will not exactly coincide. 1. 28, called in to elucidate, is of doubtful authenticity. See Rawlinson for a probable list. But the method of systematising the geography or geographical passages and remarks in the work of Herodotus, without allowing for the differences of source and interest, is unsound.

39. 2. **ἡ δὲ δὴ ἑτέρη.** Hdt. had plainly no conception of the existence of the Persian Gulf, no knowledge of the true lie of the Arabian peninsula, or he would not have included *ἡ Περσικὴ* in this second *ἀκτή*, nor would he have projected the *ἀκτὴ* as running along towards the west. The Arabian Gulf and Egypt conventionally terminate this *ἀκτή*; yet Hdt. seems to propose that Egypt and Libya should be included in it. It is obvious by the way that he has no conception of the real shape of Africa, and probably conceives it as resembling Asia Minor, cp. c. 42 *infra*, and Appendix XII.

5. **νόμῳ.** Hdt. then is following some authority and will not quite break with convention in his geography. The authority is perhaps Ionian, his dissent in part a product of his Egyptian tour. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

τὸν κόλπον τ. Ἀ. The Red sea of to-day, the size of which Hdt. greatly under-estimates, see 2. 11.

Δαρεῖος. 2. 158.

10. **ἔθνεα τρία.** Obviously Persians, Assyrians, and Arabians. Rawlinson substitutes Phoenicians for Persians, and Blakesley agrees with him, but then B. wants to cut out the words *ἥ τε Περσικὴ . . Ἀραβίη supra* as spurious.

40. 2. **τὰ κατύπερθε**=*τὰ πρὸς ἠῶ* are bounded on the south by the Erythraean sea, on the north by the Caspian sea and the river Araxes, on the east by Indi, or rather the unknown desert beyond, *Ἰνδῶν γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ ἐρημίη ἐστὶ διὰ τὴν ψάμμον* 3. 98.

ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα, ἔνθεν μὲν ἡ Ἐρυθρὴ παρήκει θάλασσα, πρὸς βορέω δὲ ἡ Κασπίη τε θάλασσα καὶ ὁ Ἀράξης ποταμός, ῥέων πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα. μέχρι δὲ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς οἰκέεται Ἀσίη· τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἔρημος ἤδη τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ, οὐδὲ ἔχει οὐδεὶς φράσαι οἷον δή τί ἐστι.

Τοιαύτη μὲν καὶ τοσαύτη ἡ Ἀσίη ἐστί, ἡ δὲ Λιβύη ἐν τῇ 41
ἀκτῇ τῇ ἑτέρῃ ἐστί· ἀπὸ γὰρ Αἰγύπτου Λιβύη ἤδη ἐκδέκεται.
κατὰ μέν νυν Αἴγυπτον ἡ ἀκτὴ αὕτη στεινή ἐστι· ἀπὸ γὰρ
τῆσδε τῆς θαλάσσης ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν δέκα μυριάδες
εἰσὶ ὀργυιέων, αὗται δ' ἂν εἶεν χίλιοι στάδιοι· τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ
στεινοῦ τούτου κάρτα πλατέα τυγχάνει ἐοῦσα ἡ ἀκτὴ ἥτις Λιβύη
κέκληται. θωμάζω ὦν τῶν διουρισάντων καὶ διελόντων Λιβύην 42

5. **ἡ Κασπίη.** Hdt. must have full credit for the assertion that the Caspian is an inland sea, but it must also be admitted that he appears to think its greater length lies E. and W. Of the Sea of Aral he knows nothing. To suppose that in his day the two formed one is violent. Time was undoubtedly when the whole 'Aralo-Caspian Depression' was part of a greater inland sea extending from the Euxine to the Frozen Ocean (cp. Stanford's Compendium, *Europe*, p. 168, *Asia*, pp. 400, 408-9), but one might almost as well suppose that those geographers, who made the Caspian an arm of the ocean, followed an historical tradition, as that the separation of the Caspian and the Aral occurred in historic times, and indeed since the days of Herodotus, as some commentators appear willing to do. Aral is apparently more in the nature of a great lake, being fed by the Oxus and the Sir, while the Caspian, which lies nearly 250 feet lower, is a real relic of the ocean.

ὁ Ἀράξης is here a river east of the Caspian, and flowing towards the E. away from the Caspian. In 1. 202 it is a river rising in Matiene and having one mouth emptying into the Caspian, and thirty-nine others, which lose themselves in marshes. It forms the southern frontier of the Massagetae. It is said to be both greater and smaller than the Danube. The simplest hypothesis which explains these inconsistencies is the supposition that under the same name are confounded two (or more) totally different rivers, the Kur which rises in Matiene and flows E. into the Caspian, and one of the great rivers of central Asia E. of the Caspian, the Oxus, or Jaxartes, which however flow *north-westwards* into the Aral. To suppose that Hdt. meant here to write westward and wrote eastward by a slip, is to assume that Hdt. was accurately informed on the region, a thing not probable. In c. 11 *supra* an Araxes is the boundary between the former land of the Scyths and Kimmeria. It is of course possible that the errors or inconsistencies arose, in the first instance, from the confusion of various streams under one generic name, as might happen with our own Avons and Ouses.

41. 1. **ἡ δὲ Λιβύη** comes in for fuller ethnographical description ἐν τοῖς Λιβυκοῖσι λόγοις which form the second part of this Book. Cp. Introduction, p. xxxii.

ἐν τῇ ἀκτῇ. Hdt. first represents Libya as comprised in the second prolongation of Asia; a few lines lower as being an individual or third ἀκτή. If he has a geographical system, it is not completely articulated. Cp. c. 44 *infra*.

2. **ἀπὸ** excludes Libya from Egypt and Egypt from Libya. Cp. 2. 16.

5. **χίλιοι.** The direct distance across the isthmus of Suez is less than 700 (R.). Hdt.'s estimate is probably based on the journey.

6. **πλατέα.** The *breadth* of Libya is apparently conceived by Hdt. north and south: its length as east and west. 'Broad' as it is, however, it does not extend, in Hdt.'s conception, so far south as the tropic of Capricorn. Cp. c. 42 *ad fin.*

42. 1. **θωμάζω.** Hdt. expresses astonishment that any persons should have adopted a tripartite division of the earth, seeing that one of the divisions,

τε καὶ Ἀσίην καὶ Εὐρώπην· οὐ γὰρ σμικρὰ τὰ διαφέροντα αὐτέων ἐστί· μήκεϊ μὲν γὰρ παρ' ἀμφοτέρας παρήκει ἡ Εὐρώπη, εὔρεος δὲ πέρι οὐδὲ συμβάλλειν ἀξίη φαίνεταί μοι εἶναι. Λιβύη μὲν γὰρ δηλοῖ [ἑωυτὴν] ἐοῦσα περίρρυτος, πλὴν ὅσον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν Ἀσίην οὐρίζει, Νεκῶ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέος πρώτου τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν καταδέξαντος· ὃς ἐπείτε τὴν διώρυχα ἐπαύσατο ὀρύσσων τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Νείλου διέχουσαν ἐς τὸν Ἀράβιον κόλπον, ἀπέπεμψε Φοίνικας ἄνδρας πλοίοισι, ἐντειλάμενος ἐς τὸ ὀπίσω δι' Ἡρακλέων στηλέων ἐκπλέειν ἕως ἐς τὴν βορηίην θάλασσαν καὶ οὕτω ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπικνέεσθαι. ὁρμηθέντες ὦν οἱ Φοίνικες ἐκ τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς θαλάσσης ἔπλεον τὴν νοτίην θάλασσαν· ὅκως δὲ γίνοιτο φθινόπωρον, προσσχόντες ἂν σπείρεσκον τὴν γῆν, ἵνα ἑκάστοτε τῆς Λιβύης πλέοντες γινοίατο, καὶ μένεσκον τὸν ἄμητον· θερίσαντες δ' ἂν τὸν σῖτον ἔπλεον, ὥστε δύο ἐτέων διεξελθόντων τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ κάμψαντες Ἡρακλέας στήλας ἀπίκοντο ἐς Αἴγυπτον. καὶ ἔλεγον ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστά, ἄλλῳ δὲ δή τεῳ, ὡς περιπλώοντες τὴν Λιβύην τὸν ἥλιον ἔσχον ἐς τὰ δεξιά.

Europe, is vastly greater than the other two, Asia and Libya, put together; so extensive indeed as to have been only partially explored. Europe is separated from Asia by the line of the Pontos, Phasis, Caspian, and Araxes.

Hdt. disregards alike the boundary laid down by Hekataios, viz. the Tanais (c. 45 *infra*) and the modern boundary of the Ural mountains and river, which, however, is neither physically nor politically defensible (cp. Stanford's *Europe*, pp. 2 ff.): Siberia and central Asia, so far as known to him, are reckoned to his Europe. In this again, there is a certain accidental anticipation of modern geography, which views the geographical boundary between Asia and Europe as purely conventional. Regarded from a strictly geographical view, "Europe is after all only a peninsula of Asia" (Stanford's *Europe*, p. 1, and *pass.*). If Hdt. had only made Europe instead of Libya an ἀκτὴ of Asia!

6. **Νεκῶ.** See 2. 158-9. It is characteristic of Hdt.'s methods that this important act of Necho's reign, which was no doubt a piece of his policy of maritime aggrandisement, should come in here by a side wind: but the record, for that very reason, is the more trustworthy. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxi.

7. **τὴν διώρυχα.** 2. 158, and c. 39 *supra*.

9. **πλοίοισι**, 'galleys.'

ἐντειλάμενος. This injunction of Necho's does not in the least prove that the form of Libya was then already *known*, or even the *fact* of its peninsularity and therefore that this was not the first circumnavigation (*pace* G. W. *apud* Rawlinson). The terms of the direction, if authentic, might have been hypothetical.

10. **τὴν βορ. θάλασσαν.** The Mediterranean.

12. **τῆς Ἐ. θ.** seems here to stand for the Arabian Gulf: the whole for the part.

13. **σπείρεσκον.** This is not incredible, see Rawlinson's note *ad l.*

17. **ἐμοὶ μὲν κτλ.** Cp. c. 5 *supra* and Introduction, § 22.

18. **τὸν ἥλιον.** This assertion that the circumnavigators of Libya had the sun to the *north* of them (for a time), has generally been taken as a conclusive argument of the reality of this voyage, the rather because Hdt. disbelieves it. Blakesley, in a highly ingenious note[128], disputes the argument, and represents the statement as an inference made by analogy from the northern hemisphere. Against the incredulity of Blakesley we may set the fact that Africa is circumnavigable, and the consideration that an actual circumnavigation even in Necho's time was a possibility. Hdt., be it observed, does

οὕτω μὲν αὕτη ἐγνώσθη τὸ πρῶτον, μετὰ δὲ Καρχηδόνιοί εἰσι 43
οἱ λέγοντες· ἐπεὶ Σατάσπης γε ὁ Τεάσπιος ἀνὴρ Ἀχαιμενίδης οὐ περιέπλωσε Λιβύην, ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο πεμφθείς, ἀλλὰ δείσας τό τε μῆκος τοῦ πλόου καὶ τὴν ἐρημίην ἀπῆλθε ὀπίσω, οὐδ' ἐπετέλεσε τὸν ἐπέταξέ οἱ ἡ μήτηρ ἄεθλον. θυγατέρα γὰρ Ζωπύρου τοῦ Μεγαβύζου ἐβιήσατο παρθένον· ἔπειτα μέλλοντος αὐτοῦ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίην ἀνασκολοπιεῖσθαι ὑπὸ Ξέρξεω βασιλέος, ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Σατάσπεος ἐοῦσα Δαρείου ἀδελφεὴ παραιτήσατο, φᾶσά οἱ αὐτὴ μέζω ζημίην ἐπιθήσειν ἤ περ ἐκεῖνον· Λιβύην γάρ οἱ ἀνάγκην ἔσεσθαι περιπλώειν, ἐς ὃ ἂν ἀπίκηται περιπλέων αὐτὴν ἐς τὸν Ἀράβιον κόλπον. συγχωρήσαντος δὲ Ξέρξεω ἐπὶ τούτοισι, ὁ Σατάσπης ἀπικόμενος ἐς Αἴγυπτον καὶ λαβὼν νέα τε καὶ ναύτας παρὰ τούτων ἔπλεε ἐπὶ Ἡρακλέας στήλας· διεκπλώσας δὲ καὶ κάμψας τὸ ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Λιβύης τῷ οὔνομα Σολόεις ἐστί, ἔπλεε πρὸς μεσαμβρίην· περήσας δὲ θάλασσαν πολλὴν ἐν πολλοῖσι μησί, ἐπείτε τοῦ πλεῦνος αἰεὶ ἔδεε, ἀποστρέψας ὀπίσω ἀπέπλεε ἐς Αἴγυπτον. ἐκ

---

not disbelieve the circumnavigation to have taken place. His authority for the story was perhaps Aegypto - Hellenic. Herodotus, by the way, evidently conceives Libya as a sort of parallelogram, the longer sides of which run E. and W. Cp. c. 41 *supra et al.* The plain meaning of this passage has been frequently misread. So *e.g.* [G. W.] *apud* Rawlinson thinks what Hdt. discredited was an assertion that in sailing to the north the sailor had the sun*rise* on his right: so, too, P. Gaffarel, *Eudoxe de Cyzique*, etc. Besançon 1873, p. 40.

It is to be observed that Hdt. is unacquainted with the *Periplus* of Hanno. Cp. 7. 165, Müller, *Geogr. Min.* vol. i. pp. xviii-xxxiii., 1-14, Bunbury, vol. i. c. ix. and note *infra* c. 43.

43. 1. **Καρχηδόνιοι.** The voyage alluded to may be that of Hanno; it is curious that Hdt. gives no details. Cp. c. 42 *supra*.

2. **Σατάσπης ὁ Τ. ἀ. Ἀχ.** A Teaspes is named, 7. 79, 9. 76, as father of a Pharandates, described as a Persian (but not Achaemenid). Teispes appears as a name in the Achaemenid pedigree 7. 11.

6. **Ζωπύρου τ. Μ.** This might be either one of two men: *Z. ὃς ἐς Ἀθήνας ηὐτομόλησε ἐκ Περσέων* 3. 160, *c.* 428-5 B.C. "probably the latest event recorded by Hdt." (R.). Cp. Ktesias, *Pers.* § 43. (The deserter may have brought this and other stories into Greece. But see *infra*.) Or Z. the grandfather, 3. 153. Cp. Sayce's note to 3. 150. If the elder Zopyros was governor of Babylon under Xerxes, he was probably the father of this unhappy lady.

8. **Δ. ἀ.** Both father and mother were of the royal family.

13. **νέα.** He was better off than the Phoenicians had been, who sailed in *πλοῖα*, c. 42 *supra*.

15. **Σολόεις.** Cp. 2. 32. The only spot on the Atlantic shore of Africa named by Hdt. He makes it the most westerly point of the continent: this would lead us to identify it with Cape Verde. On the other hand the voyage of Sataspes steers south from Soloeis, after passing Gibraltar: this would lead us to identify Soloeis with Cape Spartel, near Tangier (see G. W.'s note in Rawlinson, vol. ii. p. 49). But again Soloeis in Hanno, Skylax, and Ptolemy is undoubtedly Cape Cantin (see Bunbury, i. p. 329), the importance of which was exaggerated in antiquity. It seems therefore that we must return to Rennell's view that Soloeis is Cape Cantin, but add, with Bunbury, that though Hdt. was acquainted with the name he had no definite idea of its true geographical position (*op. cit.* p. 288).

δὲ ταύτης ἀπικόμενος παρὰ βασιλέα Ξέρξεα ἔλεγε φὰς τὰ προσωτάτω ἀνθρώπους μικροὺς παραπλέειν ἐσθῆτι φοινικηίῃ διαχρεωμένους, οἳ ὅκως σφεῖς καταγοίατο τῇ νηὶ φεύγεσκον πρὸς τὰ ὄρεα λείποντες τὰς πόλιας· αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀδικέειν οὐδὲν ἐσιόντες, βρωτὰ δὲ μοῦνα ἐξ αὐτέων λαμβάνειν. τοῦ δὲ μὴ περιπλῶσαι Λιβύην παντελέως αἴτιον τόδε ἔλεγε, τὸ πλοῖον τὸ πρόσω οὐ δυνατὸν ἔτι εἶναι προβαίνειν ἀλλ' ἐνίσχεσθαι. Ξέρξης δὲ οὔ οἱ συγγινώσκων λέγειν ἀληθέα οὐκ ἐπιτελέσαντά τε τὸν προκείμενον ἄεθλον ἀνεσκολόπισε, τὴν ἀρχαίην δίκην ἐπιτιμῶν. τούτου δὲ τοῦ Σατάσπεος εὐνοῦχος ἀπέδρη ἐς Σάμον, ἐπείτε ἐπύθετο τάχιστα τὸν δεσπότεα τετελευτηκότα, ἔχων χρήματα μεγάλα, τὰ Σάμιος ἀνὴρ κατέσχε, τοῦ ἐπιστάμενος τὸ οὔνομα ἑκὼν ἐπιλήθομαι.

44 *Τῆς δὲ Ἀσίης τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὸ Δαρείου ἐξευρέθη, ὃς βουλόμενος Ἰνδὸν ποταμόν, ὃς κροκοδείλους δεύτερος οὗτος ποταμῶν πάντων παρέχεται, τοῦτον τὸν ποταμὸν εἰδέναι τῇ ἐς θάλασσαν ἐκδιδοῖ, πέμπει πλοίοισι ἄλλους τε τοῖσι ἐπίστευε τὴν ἀληθείην ἐρέειν καὶ δὴ καὶ Σκύλακα ἄνδρα Καρυανδέα. οἱ δὲ ὁρμηθέντες ἐκ Κασπατύρου τε πόλιος καὶ τῆς Πακτυϊκῆς γῆς ἔπλεον κατὰ ποταμὸν*

---

19. **φοινικηίῃ.** Hdt. uses the word in two senses: (1) of the date palm 1. 194, 2. 86, 3. 20; (2) = *Φοινικικός*, Phoenician. Here the word must be taken in the first meaning. His word for scarlet is *φοινίκεος*.

21. **πόλιας.** We might have expected *κώμας*.

24. **ἐνίσχεσθαι.** Xerxes and apparently Hdt. disbelieved this statement; but it also furnishes an undesigned confirmation to us of the truth of the report, as we may reasonably refer this trait in the story to "the well-known southerly trade wind" (R.). Cp. c. 42 *supra*.

Whether Hdt. heard this story of Sataspes in Athens, or in Egypt, or in Samos, may reasonably be questioned: probably in Samos, or from a Samian source, as the finale suggests.

29. **τὸ οὔνομα ἑ. ἐπιλ.** Is it a case of 'de mortuis nil nisi bonum'? Cp. 1. 51, and De Joinville, *St. Louis*, Hutton's Tr. ed. 1868, p. 63, "I could easily name them [some cowards], but abstain from doing so, seeing that they are dead." If the anonymous Samian was Hdt.'s authority he had not stipulated for the suppression of his name (*ἑκών*).

44. 2. **κροκοδείλους.** Two species of *alligator*, the harmless 'sharp-nosed,' and dangerous 'snub-nosed,' frequent most of the large rivers of India, and even the tanks. Stanford, *Asia*, p. 284.

δεύτερος οὗτος. Second of two, cp. 1. 25, c. 113 *infra*. The other in this case of course is the Nile. The river mentioned 2. 32, he forgets, or considers fabulous, or identifies with Nile.

5. **Σκύλαξ** of Karyanda (in Caria, N. of Halikarnassos). Though Hdt. does not say that Skylax was an *author* as well as a *discoverer* it seems probable even from this passage. Aristot. *Pol.* 4. 14, 3, 1332[b] quotes Skylax on the Indians. The *Periplus* which has come down to us is certainly a pseudepigraphon of much later date. (Müller, *Geogr. Minores*, ed. Didot, i. pp. xxiii-li., 15-96.)

Κασπατύρου. See Sayce on 3. 102, who identifies it, as do most authorities, with Kabul. Rawlinson questions this (note [5] to 3. 102) on the ground that Hdt. places the city on the Indus: as if Hdt. were incapable of a geographical error! Baehr, indeed, argues that Hdt. does not expressly locate the start on the Indus.

πρὸς ἠῶ τε καὶ ἡλίου ἀνατολὰς ἐς θάλασσαν, διὰ θαλάσσης δὲ πρὸς ἑσπέρην πλέοντες τριηκοστῷ μηνὶ ἀπικνέονται ἐς τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον ὅθεν ὁ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς τοὺς Φοίνικας τοὺς πρότερον εἶπα ἀπέστειλε περιπλώειν Λιβύην. μετὰ δὲ τούτους περιπλώσαντας Ἰνδούς τε κατεστρέψατο Δαρεῖος καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ ταύτῃ ἐχρᾶτο. οὕτω καὶ τῆς Ἀσίης, πλὴν τὰ πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα, τὰ ἄλλα ἀνεύρηται ὅμοια παρεχομένη τῇ Λιβύῃ.

45 *Ἡ δὲ Εὐρώπη πρὸς οὐδαμῶν φανερή ἐστι γινωσκομένη, οὔτε τὰ πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα οὔτε τὰ πρὸς βορέην, εἰ περίρρυτός ἐστι· μήκεϊ δὲ γινώσκεται παρ' ἀμφοτέρας παρήκουσα. οὐδ' ἔχω συμβαλέσθαι ἐπ' ὅτευ μιῇ ἐούσῃ γῇ οὐνόματα τριφάσια κέεται ἐπωνυμίας ἔχοντα γυναικῶν, καὶ οὐρίσματα αὐτῇ Νεῖλός τε ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ποταμὸς ἐτέθη καὶ Φᾶσις ὁ Κόλχος (οἱ δὲ Τάναϊν ποταμὸν τὸν Μαιήτην καὶ πορθμήια τὰ Κιμμέρια λέγουσι), οὐδὲ τῶν διουρισάντων τὰ οὐνόματα πυθέσθαι, καὶ ὅθεν ἔθεντο τὰς ἐπωνυμίας. ἤδη γὰρ Λιβύη μὲν ἐπὶ Λιβύης λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔχειν τὸ οὔνομα γυναικὸς αὐτόχθονος, ἡ δὲ Ἀσίη ἐπὶ τῆς Προμηθέος γυναικὸς τὴν ἐπωνυμίην. καὶ τούτου μὲν μεταλαμβάνονται τοῦ οὐνόματος Λυδοί, φάμενοι ἐπὶ Ἀσίεω τοῦ Κότυος τοῦ Μάνεω κεκλῆσθαι τὴν Ἀσίην, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς*

---

7. **πρὸς ἠῶ.** As R. admits, the real course of the Indus is rather west of south, nor is it easy to relate this 'sea,' east of the Indians, into which the truthful Skylax sailed, with the sandy desert east of the Indians 3. 98, except by allowing that Hdt. is not even systematic in his geography.

10. **πρότερον.** c. 42 *supra*.

11. **Ἰνδοὺς κατεστρ.** Cp. 3. 94, 98-105. The conquest included perhaps only the Panjab. The account of the campaign is not preserved: it is inferred from the epigraphic evidence that it took place before the Scythian expedition, but after the inscription at Behistun was cut. See Rawlinson, iii. p. 37 n.

45. 2. **τὰ π. βορέην.** Maps to illustrate Hdt.'s geography therefore should not represent ocean on the N. of Europe (Rennell, Baehr), but should shade off into space. The earth of Hdt., like our own world, goes off into indefinity.

3. **παρήκουσα.** See c. 42 *supra*. The *μῆκος* runs east and west.

4. **ἐπ' ὅτευ,** "for what reason," St.

μιῇ . . τριφάσια. In his search for physical causes Hdt. overlooks practical convenience.

7. **τὸν Μαιήτην** seems to distinguish it from some other Tanais: but all the rivers here mentioned have local appellations added. Stein suggests that Hdt. takes the expression from an author he is quoting: is that Hekataios? (Van Herwerden obelises the words and adds *expectes καὶ λίμνην τὴν Μαιῆτιν*.)

Later writers, including those of Imperial times, recurred to the Tanais as the boundary (cp. Polybius, 3. 37, 3, Pomp. Mela, lib. 2, *ad init.*). We have here a reminiscence of the river frontiers, perhaps of the island-theory, of the continents. Cp. Berger, *Gesch. d. wissenschaft. Erdkunde*, pp. 65 ff.

πορθμήια τὰ Κιμμέρια. c. 12 *supra*.

8. **ὅθεν** = *ἀπ' ὅτεων*, Stein.

11. **γυναικός.** According to some Prometheus was the son of Asia. Eustathius read *μητρός* in this passage: cp. Baehr *ad l.*

13. **Κότυος.** In 1. 94 Atys is the son of Manes, and in 1. 7 Lydos not Asias the grandson (Manes—Atys—Lydos: Manes—Kotys—Asias). It is likely enough that it was in Lydia (Ἀσία πόλις Λυδίας παρὰ τῷ Τμώλῳ Steph.

Προμηθέος Ἀσίης· ἀπ' ὅτευ καὶ τὴν ἐν Σάρδισι φυλὴν κεκλῆσθαι Ἀσιάδα. ἡ δὲ δὴ Εὐρώπη οὔτε εἰ περίρρυτός ἐστι γινώσκεται πρὸς οὐδαμῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὔτε ὁκόθεν τὸ οὔνομα ἔλαβε τοῦτο, οὔτε ὅστις οἱ ἦν ὁ θέμενος φαίνεται, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς Τυρίης φήσομεν Εὐρώπης λαβεῖν τὸ οὔνομα τὴν χώρην· πρότερον δὲ ἦν ἄρα ἀνώνυμος ὥσπερ αἱ ἕτεραι. ἀλλ' αὕτη γε ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίης τε φαίνεται ἐοῦσα καὶ οὐκ ἀπικομένη ἐς τὴν γῆν ταύτην ἥτις νῦν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων Εὐρώπη καλέεται, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐκ Φοινίκης ἐς Κρήτην, ἐκ Κρήτης δὲ ἐς Λυκίην. ταῦτα μέν νυν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω· τοῖσι γὰρ νομιζομένοισι αὐτῶν χρησόμεθα.

46 Ὁ δὲ Πόντος ὁ Εὔξεινος, ἐπ' ὃν ἐστρατεύετο ὁ Δαρεῖος, χωρέων πασέων παρέχεται ἔξω τοῦ Σκυθικοῦ ἔθνεα ἀμαθέστατα. οὔτε γὰρ ἔθνος τῶν ἐντὸς τοῦ Πόντου οὐδὲν ἔχομεν προβαλέσθαι σοφίης πέρι οὔτε ἄνδρα λόγιον οἴδαμεν γενόμενον, πάρεξ τοῦ Σκυθικοῦ ἔθνεος καὶ Ἀναχάρσιος. τῷ δὲ Σκυθικῷ γένεϊ ἓν μὲν τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπηίων πρηγμάτων σοφώτατα πάντων ἐξεύρηται τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, τὰ μέντοι ἄλλα οὐκ ἄγαμαι· τὸ δὲ μέγιστον οὕτω σφι ἀνεύρηται ὥστε ἀποφυγεῖν τε μηδένα ἐπελθόντα ἐπὶ σφέας, μὴ βουλομένους τε ἐξευρεθῆναι καταλαβεῖν μὴ οἷόν τε εἶναι. τοῖσι γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα ᾖ ἐκτισμένα, ἀλλὰ φερέοικοι ἐόντες πάντες ἔωσι ἱπποτοξόται, ζῶντες μὴ ἀπ' ἀρότου

Byz.) or on the banks of the Kayster (*Il.* 2. 461), that the Hellenes first heard the name, which was gradually extended to the whole continent.

17. **Τυρίης.** 1. 2, Europa is the daughter of the King of Tyre: the King's name Agenor may be obtained from c. 147 *infra;* and from 1. 173 it may be inferred that if Europa went from Krete to Lykia—then called Milyas—it was in company with her son Sarpedon. This version differs from the Homeric, and is perhaps traceable to Hesiod. Cp. Stein, note to 1. 173.

23. **τοῖσι νομιζομένοισι.** That is, Hdt. adopts for practical purposes the tripartition of the earth, and the current nomenclature, though regarding them as arbitrary. Cp. c. 39 *supra.*

46. 1. **ἐπ' ὃν . . χωρέων.** The Pontos must be taken to include the *ἔθνη ἐντὸς τ. Π.*

ὁ Δαρεῖος. For a moment the thread of the narrative is resumed, only to be dropped again immediately: the chapter perhaps belongs to the first draft, or stratum, of the Book, or rather of the *Σκυθικοὶ λόγοι.*

2. **ἔξω τοῦ Σκ.** del. Gompertz.

3. **ἐντὸς** Stein takes as equivalent to 'west' of the Pontos. Cp. 1. 6, 174, 4. 28. But in 6. 44 it means east (of Macedonia) and here the sense demands that the shores of the Pontos itself should be understood. Cp. 6. 33 *ἔσω ἐς τὸν Εὔξεινον πόντον*, 7. 36 *ἔσωθεν.*

4. **λόγιον,** *v.l.* *λόγιμον.* Hdt. has abandoned part of the theory of the ideal savage, but not the whole. Cp. c. 32 *supra* and c. 82 *infra.* Anacharsis, c. 76 *infra.*

11. **φερέοικοι.** Not literally, but as he explains just below *ἐπὶ ζευγέων.* *φ.* is Hesiod's word for a snail. Cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

ἱπποτοξόται. Scythian archers are represented on foot (cp. Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, Ab. 315, after *Antiq. du Bosph. Cimmérien*, pl. 33); but we can hardly doubt that they were also mounted. There were *ἱπποτοξόται* in the army of Mardonios at Plataea 9. 49. Cp. Thuc. 2. 96 *εἰσὶ δ' οἱ Γέται καὶ οἱ ταύτῃ ὅμοροί τε τοῖς Σκύθαις καὶ ὁμόσκευοι πάντες ἱπποτοξόται.*

ζῶντες κτλ. Cp. Aristotle's *ζῶσα*

ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κτηνέων, οἰκήματά τέ σφι ᾖ ἐπὶ ζευγέων, κῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴησαν οὗτοι ἄμαχοί τε καὶ ἄποροι προσμίσγειν; ἐξεύρηται δέ 47 *σφι ταῦτα τῆς τε γῆς ἐούσης ἐπιτηδέης καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν ἐόντων σφι συμμάχων. ἥ τε γὰρ γῆ ἐοῦσα πεδιὰς αὕτη ποιώδης τε καὶ εὔυδρός ἐστι, ποταμοί τε δι' αὐτῆς ῥέουσι οὐ πολλῷ τεῳ ἀριθμὸν ἐλάσσονες τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διωρύχων. ὅσοι δὲ ὀνομαστοί τέ εἰσι αὐτῶν καὶ προσπλωτοὶ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, τούτους ὀνομανέω . . . . Ἴστρος μὲν πεντάστομος, μετὰ δὲ Τύρης τε καὶ Ὕπανις καὶ Βορυσθένης καὶ Παντικάπης καὶ Ὑπάκυρις καὶ Γέρρος καὶ Τάναϊς. ῥέουσι δὲ οἵδε κατὰ τάδε.*

Ἴστρος μέν, ἐὼν μέγιστος ποταμῶν πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, 48

γεωργία Pol. 1. 8, 6, 1256[a]. Hdt.'s admiration seems to condemn the *ἀροτῆρες* and *γεωργοί*, who must be supposed to have had settled habitations.

47. 3. **πεδιάς.** For the general truth of this description cp. Stanford's *Europe*, c. vi.

5. **διωρύχων.** Cp. 2. 108. It may be inferred that the visit of Hdt. to Egypt preceded the journey to the Pontos, cp. Introduction, § 21. After *ὀνομανέω* Stein would insert *εἰσὶ δὲ ὀκτὼ οἵδε*. Hdt. is correct in giving prominence to the river system of Scythia, or South Russia, a region which not only includes some of the greatest rivers of Europe, but also has common features, arising from the large scale and homogeneity of the country drained by those rivers. But Hdt.'s statements reveal the limitations of his knowledge. Three of the rivers cannot be identified: and though the Wolga does not belong to the Scythia of Hdt., the absence of any clear reference here, or elsewhere, to the largest Russian or European river can only be put down to blameless ignorance (cp. cc. 124, 125 *infra*). In regard to six of the rivers Hdt. adopts what may be called a Lake-origin theory. That he rejects the rival theory of the Rhipaean mountains, to which even Aristotle relapses (*Meteor.* 1. 13, 350[b] *ὑπ' αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν ἄρκτον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐσχάτης Σκυθίας αἱ καλούμεναι Ῥῖπαι, περὶ ὧν τοῦ μεγέθους λίαν εἰσὶν οἱ λεγόμενοι λόγοι μυθώδεις· ῥέουσι δ' οὖν οἱ πλεῖστοι καὶ μέγιστοι μετὰ τὸν Ἴστρον τῶν ἄλλων ποταμῶν ἐντεῦθεν ὥς φασιν*) may be put down to his credit: but though Russia contains the largest lakes in Europe, they have nothing to do with the rivers of the south, most of which, however, "agree in having their sources in comparatively low-lying regions amid a labyrinth of waters" (Stanford, *Europe*, p. 177). Some are anxious to see in these marshy labyrinths the Lakes of Herodotus, and even suppose physical transformation scenes since his day to enhance his credit: it is more natural to recognise that his information is imperfect or incorrect.

48. 1. **Ἴστρος μέν.** The Istros and its tributaries (cc. 48-50). To complete the Herodotean conceptions of the course of the Danube 2. 33, 34 must be read in connexion with the present passage. From that context the following items may be added: (1) the rise of the Danube, by *the 'city' Pyrene*, in the land of the Kelts, beyond the Pillars of Herakles. (2) The course of the river through the whole length of Europe (*διὰ πάσης Εὐρώπης*), bar the territory of the Kynesii west of the Kelts, dividing the continent into *two* (*equal*) *parts* (*μέσην σχίζων τὴν Εὐρώπην*, a statement which, if pressed, conflicts with the ignorance of north Europe c. 45 *supra*, but *μέσην* may be fairly taken as a loose expression: cp. *μέσον σχίζων τὸν Αἶμον* c. 49, l. 8 *infra*). (3) The exact location of the embouchure of the river *beside the Milesian colony of Istria in the 'meridian' of Sinope* (*sic*), Kilikia aspera and Egypt. Whether these data are more remarkable for the knowledge than for the ignorance displayed in them is a fair question. The sources of the Danube, which rises in the Black Forest, are located much too far west: the ignorance of the Rhone, not to mention other streams, implied in Hdt.'s description of the course of the river, is surprising. It is plain that Hdt. rightly conceives the Danube as running from W. to E. and

ἴσος αἰεὶ αὐτὸς ἑωυτῷ ῥέει καὶ θέρεος καὶ χειμῶνος, πρῶτος δὲ τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἑσπέρης τῶν ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ ῥέων κατὰ τοιόνδε μέγιστος γέγονε· ποταμῶν καὶ ἄλλων ἐς αὐτὸν ἐκδιδόντων εἰσὶ δὴ οἵδε οἱ μέγαν αὐτὸν ποιεῦντες, διὰ μέν γε τῆς Σκυθικῆς χώρης πέντε μὲν οἱ ῥέοντες, τόν τε Σκύθαι Πόρατα καλέουσι Ἕλληνες δὲ Πυρετόν, καὶ ἄλλος Τιάραντος καὶ Ἄραρός τε καὶ Νάπαρις καὶ Ὀρδησσός. ὁ μὲν πρῶτος λεχθεὶς τῶν ποταμῶν μέγας καὶ πρὸς ἠῶ ῥέων ἀνακοινοῦται τῷ Ἴστρῳ τὸ ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος λεχθεὶς Τιάραντος πρὸς ἑσπέρης τε μᾶλλον καὶ ἐλάσσων, ὁ δὲ δὴ Ἄραρός τε καὶ ὁ Νάπαρις καὶ ὁ Ὀρδησσὸς διὰ μέσου τούτων ἰόντες ἐσβάλλουσι ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον.

49 οὗτοι μὲν αὐθιγενέες Σκυθικοὶ ποταμοὶ συμπληθύουσι αὐτόν, ἐκ δὲ Ἀγαθύρσων Μάρις ποταμὸς ῥέων συμμίσγεται τῷ Ἴστρῳ, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Αἵμου τῶν κορυφέων τρεῖς ἄλλοι μεγάλοι ῥέοντες πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον ἐσβάλλουσι ἐς αὐτόν, Ἄτλας καὶ Αὔρας καὶ Τίβισις. διὰ δὲ Θρηίκης καὶ Θρηίκων τῶν Κροβύζων ῥέοντες Ἄθρυς καὶ Νόης καὶ Ἀρτάνης ἐκδιδοῦσι ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον· ἐκ δὲ Παιόνων καὶ ὄρεος Ῥοδόπης Κίος ποταμὸς μέσον σχίζων τὸν Αἷμον ἐκδιδοῖ ἐς αὐτόν. ἐξ Ἰλλυριῶν

---

he apparently conceives it as bending to the south (so as to form the W. boundary of Scythia, cp. 5. 3 *infra*) though it bends again to the E. (cp. c. 99 *infra*). The final bend eastwards is correct enough. The previous bend, if Hdt.'s conception is rightly interpreted, is wholly misconceived: a confusion between the Danube and the Pruth perhaps underlies the misconception. (4) The observation of the absence of flood on the lower Danube is correct, but the explanation is not according to knowledge. The true cause is to be sought in the action of that monster *Strid*, 'the Iron Gates,' which serve as a valve and equalise the flow of water by flooding the plain of Hungary. Cp. c. 50 *infra*.

2. **πρῶτος δέ.** And so forms the western frontier of Scythia: cp. ἐς τὰ πλάγια τῆς Σκυθίης ἐσβάλλει c. 49 *infra ad fin*. Cp. also note *infra* on the Pruth, and 5. 3. For μὲν οἱ ῥ. Schenkl suggests μὲν οἱ συρρέοντες. Stein μεγάλοι ῥέοντες.

Of the five Scythian tributaries the Πόρατα may be identified with the Pruth. The identification of the other four is quite uncertain.

9. **πρὸς ἠῶ ῥέων.** The Pruth flows south, but this misdescription supports the view that according to Hdt. the Istros forms the western frontier of Scythia.

49. 2. **Μάρις.** If this is the Marosch it is not a tributary of the Danube.

3. **Αἵμου.** Extended by Hdt. to include the whole chain of mountains N. of Macedon, as well as the Balkan proper.

4. **μεγάλοι.** An easy way of reconciling Hdt. with the facts is to read οὐ μεγάλοι, but it rests on the erroneous supposition that Hdt. must have had accurate information even on such outlandish points. The six rivers next mentioned cannot be satisfactorily identified. Hansen, *Ost-Europa*, §§ 99, 100, suggests the rearrangement of the passage, so that ἐσβάλλουσι . . Τίβισις should follow Ἴστρῳ. αὐτὸν then refers to the Maris, and instead of six there are only three tributaries of the Danube to be accounted for, the Maris and its tributaries representing "the system of the Theiss." On this theory the text must further run: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Αἵμου . . . ῥέοντες διὰ Θρηίκης κτλ. and the displacement, as Hansen suggests, may have been facilitated by the resemblance of Ἄτλας and Ἄθρυς. Ingenious rather than convincing, this suggestion again is open to the same objection as the former.

7. **Κίος.** The Ὄσκιος of Thuc. 2. 96, now Isker. Σκίος is read here by most editors.

8. **σχίζων τὸν Αἷμον.** "This is untrue" Rawlinson.

δὲ ῥέων πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον Ἄγγρος ποταμὸς ἐσβάλλει ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τριβαλλικὸν καὶ ἐς ποταμὸν Βρόγγον, ὁ δὲ Βρόγγος ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον· οὕτω ἀμφοτέρους ἐόντας μεγάλους ὁ Ἴστρος δέκεται. ἐκ δὲ τῆς κατύπερθε χώρης Ὀμβρικῶν Κάρπις ποταμὸς καὶ ἄλλος Ἄλπις ποταμὸς πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον καὶ οὗτοι ῥέοντες ἐκδιδοῦσι ἐς αὐτόν· ῥέει γὰρ δὴ διὰ πάσης τῆς Εὐρώπης ὁ Ἴστρος, ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν, οἳ ἔσχατοι πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμέων μετὰ Κύνητας οἰκέουσι τῶν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ· ῥέων δὲ διὰ πάσης τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὰ πλάγια τῆς Σκυθίης ἐσβάλλει.

50 τούτων ὧν τῶν καταλεχθέντων καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν συμβαλλομένων τὸ σφέτερον ὕδωρ γίνεται ὁ Ἴστρος ποταμῶν μέγιστος, ἐπεὶ ὕδωρ γε ἓν πρὸς ἓν συμβάλλειν ὁ Νεῖλος πλήθεϊ ἀποκρατέει. ἐς γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον οὔτε ποταμὸς οὔτε κρήνη οὐδεμία ἐσδιδοῦσα ἐς πλῆθός οἱ συμβάλλεται. ἴσος δὲ αἰεὶ ῥέει ἔν τε θέρεϊ καὶ χειμῶνι ὁ Ἴστρος κατὰ τοιόνδε τι, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει· τοῦ μὲν χειμῶνός ἐστι ὅσος πέρ ἐστι, ὀλίγῳ τε μέζων τῆς ἑωυτοῦ φύσιος γίνεται· ὕεται γὰρ ἡ γῆ αὕτη τοῦ χειμῶνος πάμπαν ὀλίγῳ, νιφετῷ δὲ πάντα χρᾶται· τοῦ δὲ θέρεος ἡ χιὼν ἡ

---

10. **Τριβαλλικόν.** The Triballi occupied the modern Servia and perhaps extended into Hungary (*πεδίον*). But the two rivers are again not to be identified with certainty. The tribe was strong enough to resist the Odrysian power, and Sitalkes met his death in an expedition against them, 424 B.C. Thuc. 4. 101, 5. This event perhaps brought the name forward at Athens, and ten years later Aristophanes has his laugh at their expense (*Birds*, 1533 *et al.*).

In the Carpis and Alpis which swell the Danube from the region 'north of Umbria' most persons will be content to see a strange dissolution of the Carpathians and Alps from mountains into rivers. The waters from those ranges do augment the Danube; but Hdt.'s statements can hardly rank as real knowledge.

14. **διὰ πάσης τῆς Εὐρώπης.** Cp. 2. 33 *μέσην σχίζων τὴν* Ἐ.

15. **ἐκ Κ.** *καὶ Πυρήνης πόλιος* 2. 33. Aristotle knew that Pyrene was the name of a mountain, *Meteor.* 2. 13, 350b, so that Guest, *Orig. Celt.* i. p. 37, was hardly quite accurate in describing his knowledge as "equally limited" with that of Herodotus; but he too makes Pyrene the source of the Danube.

Κύνητες. In 2. 33 Κυνήσιοι. If the readings are right Hdt.'s sources were perhaps different. Stein puts the Kynetians in Spain south of the Pyrenees; and the Kelts in Gaul, north of the Pyrenees.

17. **τὰ πλάγια.** Hdt. knew that the mouths were to the east, c. 99 *infra*.

50. 1. **τ. καταλεχθέντων.** Seventeen in number: *ἄλλων πολλῶν* may be supposed to be a saving clause with no exact knowledge behind it. Cp. c. 53 *infra*.

4. **ἐς γὰρ κτλ.** The statement is true of the Nile upwards to Khartoum: Hdt.'s knowledge does not reach so far.

5. **ἴσος αἰεί.** This statement is not correct, as the Danube and its principal tributaries are subject to great and disastrous floods. It is however approximately true of the main stream below Belgrade, for a reason given *infra*.

8. **ὕεται.** This statement is true of Scythia, and the modern Moldavia, Galicia, and Bukowina (*Europe*, p. 186), but not of the whole 'catchment basin' of the Danube. The real cause why the lower Danube preserves its volume unaugmented is, as stated c. 48 *supra*, the obstructions in "the bed of the stream below Belgrade, which regulate the stream at the cost of deluging the country above" (see Stanford's *Europe*, p. 155). These obstructions are now in process of reduction: and presumably in future the floods will be carried off by the channel instead of inundating the Hungarian lowland. Cp. *Geogr. Journal*, i. 243 ff. (1893).

ἐν τῷ χειμῶνι πεσοῦσα, ἐοῦσα ἀμφιλαφής, τηκομένη πάντοθεν ἐσδιδοῖ ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον. αὕτη τε δὴ ἡ χιὼν ἐσδιδοῦσα ἐς αὐτὸν συμπληθύει καὶ ὄμβροι πολλοί τε καὶ λάβροι σὺν αὐτῇ· ὕει γὰρ δὴ τὸ θέρος. ὅσῳ δὲ πλέον ἐπ' ἑωυτὸν ὕδωρ ὁ ἥλιος ἐπέλκεται ἐν τῷ θέρεϊ ἢ ἐν τῷ χειμῶνι, τοσούτῳ τὰ συμμισγόμενα τῷ Ἴστρῳ πολλαπλήσιά ἐστι τοῦ θέρεος ἤ περ τοῦ χειμῶνος· ἀντιτιθέμενα δὲ ταῦτα ἀντισήκωσις γίνεται, ὥστε ἴσον μιν αἰεὶ φαίνεσθαι ἐόντα.

51 Εἷς μὲν δὴ τῶν ποταμῶν τοῖσι Σκύθῃσί ἐστι ὁ Ἴστρος, μετὰ
δὲ τοῦτον Τύρης, ὃς ἀπὸ βορέω μὲν ἀνέμου ὁρμᾶται, ἄρχεται δὲ
ῥέων ἐκ λίμνης μεγάλης ἣ οὐρίζει τήν τε Σκυθικὴν καὶ Νευρίδα
γῆν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ κατοίκηνται Ἕλληνες οἳ Τυρῖται
52 καλέονται. τρίτος δὲ Ὕπανις ποταμὸς ὁρμᾶται μὲν ἐκ τῆς
Σκυθικῆς, ῥέει δὲ ἐκ λίμνης μεγάλης τὴν πέριξ νέμονται ἵπποι
ἄγριοι λευκοί· καλέεται δὲ ἡ λίμνη αὕτη ὀρθῶς μήτηρ Ὑπάνιος.
ἐκ ταύτης ὦν ἀνατέλλων ὁ Ὕπανις ποταμὸς ῥέει ἐπὶ μὲν πέντε
ἡμερέων πλόον βραχὺς καὶ γλυκύς ἐστι, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου πρὸς
θαλάσσης τεσσέρων ἡμερέων πλόον πικρὸς δεινῶς· ἐκδιδοῖ γὰρ
ἐς αὐτὸν κρήνη πικρή, οὕτω δή τι ἐοῦσα πικρή, ἣ μεγάθεϊ
σμικρὴ ἐοῦσα κιρνᾷ τὸν Ὕπανιν ἐόντα ποταμὸν ἐν ὀλίγοισι
μέγαν. ἔστι δὲ ἡ κρήνη αὕτη ἐν οὔροισι χώρης τῆς τε ἀροτήρων
Σκυθέων καὶ Ἀλαζόνων· οὔνομα δὲ τῇ κρήνῃ καὶ ὅθεν ῥέει τῷ
χώρῳ σκυθιστὶ μὲν Ἐξαμπαῖος, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν

---

51. 2. **Τύρης.** Tyras is the Dniestr "which rises on the Galician slopes of the Carpathians." When Mrs. Guthrie performed her journey (1795-6) the Dniestr was the frontier of the Russian Empire. (See Guthrie's *Tour*, London, 1802, p. 14.)

3. **Νευρίδα.** Cp. cc. 17 *supra*, 105 *infra*.

4. **Τυρῖται.** Tyras was a colony of Miletos (*Periplus*, 62). Like the people of Borysthenes the men of Tyras perhaps had a second name for their city, Ophiussa (Steph. B. *sub v.* Τύρας). Strabo 306 seems however to place Ophiussa some miles up the river. On a coin of Tyras the form Tyrani (ΤΥΡΑΝΟΝ) occurs: B. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 234.

52. 1. **Ὕπανις.** The Bug rises within the limits of Scythia.

2. **λ. μ.** On the 'Lake theory,' cp. note c. 47 *supra*. The Bug is still navigable (*Europe*, p. 179).

3. **μήτηρ.** Cp. c. 86 *infra*.

4. **ῥέει.** The movement is down stream; the whole distance is but nine days' journey.

5. **βραχύς,** 'shallow'; cp. ἐν τοῖσι βράχεσι c. 179 *infra*.

7. **κρήνη.** Rawlinson supposes that this fountain was a reality, and that Hdt. penetrated to it; but admits that there are no traces of it now, nor anything peculiar in the water of the Bug. The waters of all the rivers are brackish to a considerable distance from the sea: prob. (as Stein suggests) the bitter fountain is a hypothesis to explain this fact observed in the Hypanis. But if so, what becomes of Hdt.'s travels in Scythia? Cp. c. 81 *infra*. Introduction, § 21.

8. **ἐν ὀλίγοισι μέγαν,** 'inferior to few in size,' cp. 9. 41.

11. **Ἐξαμπαῖος,** c. 81 *infra*. It was perhaps a cross-roads, or Carfax, with or without a conduit. Some Etymologists see in the word two roots connected with Sansk. accha, Gk. ἄγα, Lat. Sac, Germ. Hexe, Engl. Hag; and patha, πάτος, pfad, path. (Rawlinson, iii. p. 193.) But cp. Appendix I.

Ἱραὶ ὁδοί. συνάγουσι δὲ τὰ τέρματα ὅ τε Τύρης καὶ ὁ Ὕπανις κατὰ Ἀλαζόνας, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου ἀποστρέψας ἑκάτερος ῥέει εὐρύνων τὸ μέσον.

53 Τέταρτος δὲ Βορυσθένης ποταμός, ὅς ἐστί τε μέγιστος μετὰ Ἴστρον τούτων καὶ πολυαρκέστατος κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας οὔτι μοῦνον τῶν Σκυθικῶν ποταμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων, πλὴν Νείλου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου· τούτῳ γὰρ οὐκ οἷά τέ ἐστι συμβαλεῖν ἄλλον ποταμόν· τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν Βορυσθένης ἐστὶ πολυαρκέστατος, ὃς νομάς τε καλλίστας καὶ εὐκομιδεστάτας κτήνεσι παρέχεται ἰχθύας τε ἀρίστους διακριδὸν καὶ πλείστους, πίνεσθαί τε ἥδιστός ἐστι, ῥέει τε καθαρὸς παρὰ θολεροῖσι, σπόρος τε παρ' αὐτὸν ἄριστος γίνεται, ποίη τε, τῇ οὐ σπείρεται ἡ χώρη, βαθυτάτη· ἅλες τε ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ αὐτόματοι πήγνυνται ἄπλετοι· κήτεά τε μεγάλα ἀνάκανθα, τὰ ἀντακαίους καλέουσι, παρέχεται ἐς ταρίχευσιν, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ θωμάσαι ἄξια. μέχρι μέν νυν Γερρέων χώρου, ἐς τὸν τεσσεράκοντα ἡμερέων πλόος ἐστί, γινώσκεται ῥέων ἀπὸ βορέω ἀνέμου·

---

13. **κατὰ Ἀλαζόνας.** Not "in the country of the Alazonians" (R.), but "as far inland as the Alazonians," for they were between Hypanis and Borysthenes c. 17 *supra*, north of the Scythic ἀροτῆρες and south of the Neuri. The Hypanis is a tributary of the Borysthenes or, as Hdt. says in the next chapter, empties into the same *liman*.

53. 1. **Βορυσθένης.** To the Dniepr Hdt. assigns the third place of honour among the rivers of the earth. His admiration for it is of the strictly utilitarian order. But the passage is still a poem: perhaps from a poetical source.

2. **πολυαρκέστατος**, 'plurima praebens commoda' B. So of Italy γῆ πολυαρκεστάτη, Dionys. Halic. 1. 36; of Alexandria πόλις πολυαρκεστάτη, Plut. *Alex.* 26; cp. L. & S.

γνώμας. Not αὐτοψία, which may or may not be the basis of γνώμη. Cp. the *locus classicus* 2. 99. Introduction, § 22.

6. **εὐκομιδεστάτας.** εὐκομιδής L. & S. render "well cared for." Stein suggests *zuträglichste*, *i.e.* most digestible. Mela 2. 6 has: alit laetissima pabula. The reading is not above suspicion, β giving εὐνομιδεστάτας.

7. **διακριδόν.** *Il.* 12. 103, 15. 108.

8. **παρὰ θολεροῖσι** can only refer to the other rivers, even though the statement is not accurate.

10. **ἅλες.** An important staple of commerce (Dio Chrys. p. 437) specially useful for preserving the fish.

11. **ἀνάκανθα.** Mela, *l.c.*, alit magnos pisces quibus et optimus sapor et nulla ossa sunt. (Quoted not to confirm the fact, but to suggest the meaning, or legitimate inference.)

12. **τάριχος ἀντακαῖον**, caviar, mentioned in the *Parasite* of Antiphanes (*Com. Frag.* ed. Bothe, p. 390), may have been another important article of commerce.

ἄλλα . . ἄξια. A convenient saving clause (cp. c. 50 *supra*), under which we may insert the islands, woodlands, and cataracts, which form important features in the scenery and economy of the Dniepr. Cp. Appendix II. § 7.

13. **Γερρέων.** Baehr, Kallinberg, Holder, van H. read Γέρρου. Stein conjectures Γερρίων. The river and the χῶρος have the same name, c. 56 *infra*.

τεσσεράκοντα. τεσσερακαίδεκα which has been proposed here would bring Gerrhos inside Scythia, cp. cc. 71, 127.

14. **γινώσκεται** cannot be taken to mean that Hdt. speaks from autopsy, if only by reason of the very next sentence. Nor do the words οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι just below imply that he had visited the sources of all other rivers

τὸ δὲ κατύπερθε δι' ὧν ῥέει ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς ἔχει φράσαι· φαίνεται δὲ ῥέων δι' ἐρήμου ἐς τῶν γεωργῶν Σκυθέων τὴν χώρην· οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ Σκύθαι παρ' αὐτὸν ἐπὶ δέκα ἡμερέων πλόον νέμονται. μούνου δὲ τούτου τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ Νείλου οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι τὰς πηγάς, δοκέω δέ, οὐδὲ οὐδεὶς Ἑλλήνων. ἀγχοῦ τε δὴ θαλάσσης ὁ Βορυσθένης ῥέων γίνεται καί οἱ συμμίσγεται ὁ Ὕπανις ἐς τὠυτὸ ἕλος ἐκδιδούς. τὸ δὲ μεταξὺ τῶν ποταμῶν τούτων, ἐὸν ἔμβολον τῆς χώρης, Ἱππόλεω ἄκρη καλέεται, ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ ἱρὸν Δήμητρος ἐνίδρυται· πέρην δὲ τοῦ ἱροῦ ἐπὶ τῷ Ὑπάνι Βορυσθενεῖται κατοίκηνται.

54 Ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ποταμῶν, μετὰ δὲ τούτους πέμπτος ποταμὸς ἄλλος, τῷ οὔνομα Παντικάπης, ῥέει μὲν καὶ οὗτος ἀπὸ βορέω τε καὶ ἐκ λίμνης, καὶ τὸ μεταξὺ τούτου τε καὶ τοῦ Βορυσθένεος νέμονται οἱ γεωργοὶ Σκύθαι, ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ ἐς τὴν Ὑλαίην, παραμειψάμενος δὲ ταύτην τῷ Βορυσθένεϊ συμμίσγεται.

---

he mentions except the Nile and the Borysthenes. Cp. Introduction, § 22.

17. **δέκα**, c. 18 *supra* ἔνδεκα. But here perhaps he is going down stream, or following another authority.

21. **ἕλος**. The Dniepr *liman* is one of the shallowest. "A peculiar feature of this region is the longitudinal water basins filling the outlets of all even the smallest valleys, and known as 'limans,' a term taken from the Greek language, at one time prevalent in this region. These lakes, though they have all been cut off from the sea by the deposition of alluvial matter, are yet mostly fresh, but are in some cases largely charged with salt, so that their neighbourhood is specially favourable to the growth of saline plants" (Stanford's *Europe*, p. 168 f.).

22. **ἔμβολον**. The beak of a ship. "Has the author's memory played him false or are we to suppose that the form of the land has changed since his time?" R. There is a third alternative. Yet the particularity of description here is remarkable. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

Ἱππόλεω ἄκρη. Of Hippolaos (cp. Pape, *Wörterbuch*, iii. p. 565) nothing seems known. The point is identified with Cape Stanislaos.

23. **Δήμητρος**. A deity proper to a population cultivating cereals. The reading of *a* is Μητρὸς which Baehr prefers, regarding Δήμητρος as a gloss. The worship of Kybele was widespread on the shores of Pontos. An inscription of Panticapaeum has Μητρὶ Φρυγίᾳ *C. I. G.* ii. No. 2107, and Rawlinson prints a coin of Olbia which shows a mural crown, emblem of Kybele: but oddly enough the wreath of corn, emblem of Demeter, is combined with it. The mural crown is found on representations of the Aphrodite of Askalon and Kypros, *vid.* Perrot and Chipiez, *Art of Phoenicia*, ii. 43. B. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 233, gives the head of Demeter as the principal type of the gold and silver coinage of Olbia. We are perhaps in presence of a 'contaminated' cult. Cp. Strabo, p. 469, and c. 76 *infra*.

54. 2. **Παντικάπης**. The name is plainly connected with Panticapaeum (Kertch): but the river defies identification, as do the Hypakyris and Gerrhos. It is conceivable that these difficulties may be due to great changes in the physique of the country, and that Hdt. may be unimpeachable: it is also possible that "Hdt. may have been completely at fault": considering his circumstances, the latter is the less violent hypothesis of the two—which are not, however, mutually exclusive. Hdt. has made many mistakes, and physical changes have made it doubly difficult for us to correct those mistakes. Perhaps there were three streams to be crossed by the commercial travellers between the Dniepr and the Don.

3. **λίμνης**. *Vid.* c. 47 *supra*.

5. **Ὑλαίην**, cc. 18 *supra*, 76 *infra*.

ἔκτος δὲ Ὑπάκυρις ποταμός, ὃς ὁρμᾶται μὲν ἐκ λίμνης, διὰ 55
μέσων δὲ τῶν νομάδων Σκυθέων ῥέων ἐκδιδοῖ κατὰ Καρκινῖτιν
πόλιν, ἐς δεξιὴν ἀπέργων τήν τε Ὑλαίην καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλήιον
δρόμον καλεόμενον. ἕβδομος δὲ Γέρρος ποταμὸς ἀπέσχισται 56
μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Βορυσθένεος κατὰ τοῦτο τῆς χώρης ἐς ὃ γινώσκεται
ὁ Βορυσθένης· ἀπέσχισται μέν νυν ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χώρου,
οὔνομα δὲ ἔχει τό περ ὁ χῶρος αὐτός, Γέρρος, ῥέων δὲ ἐς
θάλασσαν οὐρίζει τήν τε τῶν νομάδων χώρην καὶ τὴν τῶν
βασιληίων Σκυθέων, ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ ἐς τὸν Ὑπάκυριν. ὄγδοος δὲ δὴ 57
Τάναϊς ποταμός, ὃς ῥέει τἀνέκαθεν ἐκ λίμνης μεγάλης ὁρμώμενος,
ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ ἐς μέζω ἔτι λίμνην καλεομένην Μαιῆτιν, ἣ οὐρίζει
Σκύθας τε τοὺς βασιληίους καὶ Σαυρομάτας. ἐς δὲ Τάναϊν
τοῦτον ἄλλος ποταμὸς ἐσβάλλει τῷ οὔνομά ἐστι Ὕργις.

Τοῖσι μὲν δὴ ὀνομαστοῖσι ποταμοῖσι οὕτω δή τι οἱ Σκύθαι 58
ἐσκευάδαται, τοῖσι δὲ κτήνεσι ἡ ποίη ἀναφυομένη ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ
ἐστι ἐπιχολωτάτη πασέων ποιέων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· ἀνοιγο-

---

55. 1. **Ὑπάκυρις.** The Hypakyris not identified. See note on previous chapter.

λίμνης. See note on c. 47 *supra*.

2. **Καρκινῖτιν**, c. 99 *infra*.

3. **Ἀχιλλήιος δρόμος.** *Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλβιανὸς ἱστορεῖ τὰς εὐρείας ἠιόνας λέγεσθαι Ἀχιλλέως Δρόμους* Schol. Apoll. Rh. 2. 658 qu. by Neumann, *l.c. infra*. This, which was the most celebrated, is a narrow strip of land (now broken into two, or more, islands) extending about 80 miles, between the mouth of the Dniepr and the Crimea (*vid.* Smith, *Dict. Geogr.* p. 20), and connected with the Hylaea (c. 76 *infra*) by an isthmus. (Neumann, *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*, pp. 365 ff.) It may have looked like a colossal stadium, fit for the swift-footed hero, whose cult was popular on the coast. Cp. especially Strabo, 307.

56. 1. **Γέρρος.** The Gerrhos is the most bewildering of the Scythian rivers. It is an off-shoot of the Dniepr, which leaves that river forty days up from the sea, flows to the east and south, forms the boundary between the Nomad and Royal Scyths, and then empties itself into the unknown Hypakyris, instead of finding its way to the sea, or the Tanais. It has the same name as the land, and the people are Gerrhii. Stein suggests that the name may mean 'Border,' 'Borderland,' 'Borderers': that the border may have followed, at least in parts, the course of a stream or streams (the Donetz, Syrgis, in the east), and that in this way a confusion and error arose. Anyway the inference is plain that Hdt. is neither a first-hand nor a first-rate authority on the rivers of Scythia, although that be his best chapter on Scythian geography. Cp. Appendix II.

57. 2. **Τάναϊς.** The Tanais or Don, "more than half as long again as the Rhine" (*Europe*, p. 179), formed with Hekataios the frontier between Europe and Asia (cp. c. 45 *supra*), but with Hdt. only a part of the eastern or N.E. limit of Scythia, c. 21 *supra*. (But cp. Appendix II.)

λίμνης. As the Wolga flows from a lake some have wished to make the Tanais of Hdt. into the Wolga. But cp. c. 47 *supra* and cc. 123, 134 *infra*.

3. **ἣ οὐρίζει.** This is a statement which we might have expected c. 21 *supra*, where the Tanais is given as the boundary between Scythia and the Sauromatae, as also c. 115 *infra*. The sub-contradictions belong to various geographical strata or sources.

5. **Ὕργις**, c. 123 *infra*, appears as the *Σύργις* (perhaps the Donetz: cp. previous c.).

58. 3. **ἐπίχολος**, 'apt to generate bile.' That the reading is correct seems proved by the method of verification adduced just below. The fact was disputed, some authorities asserting that the animals grew fat, well-liking and free from gall

μένοισι δὲ τοῖσι κτήνεσί ἐστι σταθμώσασθαι ὅτι τοῦτο οὕτω ἔχει.

59 Τὰ μὲν δὴ μέγιστα οὕτω σφι εὔπορά ἐστι, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ νόμαια κατὰ τάδε σφι διακέεται. θεοὺς μὲν μούνους τούσδε ἱλάσκονται, Ἱστίην μὲν μάλιστα, ἐπὶ δὲ Δία καὶ Γῆν, νομίζοντες τὴν Γῆν τοῦ Διὸς εἶναι γυναῖκα, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἀπόλλωνά τε καὶ οὐρανίην Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Ἡρακλέα καὶ Ἄρεα. τούτους μὲν πάντες Σκύθαι νενομίκασι, οἱ δὲ καλεόμενοι βασιλήιοι Σκύθαι καὶ τῷ Ποσειδέωνι θύουσι. ὀνομάζεται δὲ σκυθιστὶ Ἱστίη μὲν Ταβιτί, Ζεὺς δὲ ὀρθότατα κατὰ γνώμην γε τὴν ἐμὴν καλεόμενος Παπαῖος, Γῆ δὲ Ἀπί. Ἀπόλλων δὲ Γοιτόσυρος, οὐρανίη δὲ Ἀφροδίτη Ἀργίμπασα, Ποσειδέων δὲ Θαγιμασάδας. ἀγάλματα δὲ καὶ βωμοὺς καὶ νηοὺς οὐ νομίζουσι ποιέειν πλὴν Ἄρεϊ· τούτῳ δὲ νομίζουσι.

---

upon the Scythian grass (Theoph. *Hist. pl.* 9. 17, 4 qu. by Stein). Hence perhaps Hdt.'s appeal to the *post mortem* demonstration; which, by the way, does not prove that he had assisted at a dissection, or sacrifice. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

59. 1. **τὰ . . μέγιστα** can hardly refer to the river system: cp. cc. 46, 47.

2. **νόμαια** is taken in apposition to *τὰ λοιπά*, as, more commonly, with *ἄλλος*, cp. c. 61 *infra*. This is ingenious, but in any case the sense and even the terms of the sentence carry back to c. 46, before the excursus on the rivers. *τὰ μέγιστα* here resumes *τὸ μέγιστον* there, and even *εὔπορα* here may be an echo of *ἄποροι* c. 46 *ad fin.* The observation confirms the suspicion that cc. 48-57, more or less, are an interpolation, or at least from a distinct source. Cp. Appendix II.

3. **ἱλάσκονται.** More usually of cult of heroes 5. 47 *infra*, but the Homeric use is as here. Cp. L. & S. *sub voc.* and *σέβομαι*.

Ἱστίην. Hestia had a certain primacy with the Greeks themselves in ritual. See Preuner, *Hestia-Vesta*, 1 ff. and Schol. to Aristoph. *Av.* 865. *Thesmoph.* 299. The Scythic Tabiti was probably the goddess of the tent, or tent-fire, and offered an analogy to the Greek Hestia. Cp. cc. 68, 127 *infra*.

νομίζοντες. That had probably been the view of the Greeks themselves at one time, ere Zeus had been distinguished from Uranos: but it was already long passed in the days of the Homero-Hesiodic theology (cp. 2. 53), in which Ge ranks with the elder deities, prae-olympian, and even at times anti-olympian.

4. **Ἀπόλλων, Ἀφροδίτη.** The sun and moon deities. The mention of Aphrodite Urania, the Tauric Artemis, again suggests the presence of the Phoenician in the Pontos prior to the advent of the Greek. For Herakles Hdt. knows no Scythic name, and he may possibly represent the Tyrian (cp. c. 8 *supra*). Rawlinson gives a representation of a Scythian god who carries cup, bow, club, and shield; but hesitates to identify him with Herakles.

5. **Ἄρεα.** Ares c. 62 *infra*. One MS. has *ἀέρα* here.

8. **ὀρθότατα.** In Hdt.'s opinion, because doubtless he connects *παπαῖος* with *πατήρ* or *πάππας* (*Od.* 6. 57). Could it be connected with the Phrygian god Papas? cp. Preller, *Gr. Myth.* i.^{3} 536.

9. **Γῆ δὲ Ἀπί.** Cp. Hom. *ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης*, *Il.* 1. 270, *Od.* 7. 25.

Γοιτόσυρος κτλ. The forms of these Scythic names vary considerably. *Γοιτόσυρος* is taken from Hesychios; Celsus ap. Orig. 6. 39 has *Γογγόσυρος*. The MSS. *οἰτόσυρος*. *Ἀργίμπασα* is the reading of one or two MSS. (PR Stein) supported by Celsus. The other MSS. vary between *ἀρτίμπασα* and *ἀρίππασα*. Hesychius has *Ἀρτιμήασα*. *Θαγιμασάδας* is an emendation by Stein, the MSS. varying between *θαγιμασάδα*, *θατιμασάδα*, *Θαμιμασάδης*, and the MSS. of Origen between *θαγιμασάδα* and *θατιμασάδα*.

10. **ἀγάλματα.** Cp. c. 26 *supra*.

Θυσίη δὲ ἡ αὐτὴ πᾶσι κατέστηκε περὶ πάντα τὰ ἱρὰ ὁμοίως, 60
ἐρδομένη ὧδε· τὸ μὲν ἱρήιον αὐτὸ ἐμπεποδισμένον τοὺς ἐμπροσ-
θίους πόδας ἕστηκε, ὁ δὲ θύων ὄπισθε τοῦ κτήνεος ἑστεὼς
σπάσας τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ στρόφου καταβάλλει μιν, πίπτοντος δὲ
τοῦ ἱρηίου ἐπικαλέει τὸν θεὸν τῷ ἂν θύῃ, καὶ ἔπειτα βρόχῳ
περὶ ὦν ἔβαλε τὸν αὐχένα, σκυταλίδα δὲ ἐμβαλὼν περιάγει καὶ
ἀποπνίγει, οὔτε πῦρ ἀνακαύσας οὔτε καταρξάμενος οὔτ' ἐπι-
σπείσας· ἀποπνίξας δὲ καὶ ἀποδείρας τράπεται πρὸς ἕψησιν.
τῆς δὲ γῆς τῆς Σκυθικῆς αἰνῶς ἀξύλου ἐούσης ὧδέ σφι ἐς τὴν 61
ἕψησιν τῶν κρεῶν ἐξεύρηται· ἐπειδὰν ἀποδείρωσι τὰ ἱρήια,
γυμνοῦσι τὰ ὀστέα τῶν κρεῶν, ἔπειτα ἐσβάλλουσι, ἢν μὲν
τύχωσι ἔχοντες, ἐς λέβητας ἐπιχωρίους, μάλιστα Λεσβίοισι
κρητῆρσι προσεικέλους, χωρὶς ἢ ὅτι πολλῷ μέζονας· ἐς τούτους
ἐσβάλλοντες ἕψουσι ὑποκαίοντες τὰ ὀστέα τῶν ἱρηίων. ἢν δὲ
μή σφι παρῇ ὁ λέβης, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὰς γαστέρας τῶν ἱρηίων
ἐσβάλλοντες τὰ κρέα πάντα καὶ παραμίξαντες ὕδωρ ὑποκαίουσι
τὰ ὀστέα· τὰ δὲ αἴθεται κάλλιστα, αἱ δὲ γαστέρες χωρέουσι
εὐπετέως τὰ κρέα ἐψιλωμένα τῶν ὀστέων· καὶ οὕτω βοῦς τε
ἑωυτὸν ἐξέψει καὶ τἆλλα ἱρήια ἑωυτὸ ἕκαστον. ἐπεὰν δὲ ἑψηθῇ
τὰ κρέα, ὁ θύσας τῶν κρεῶν καὶ τῶν σπλάγχνων ἀπαρξάμενος
ῥίπτει ἐς τὸ ἔμπροσθε. θύουσι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πρόβατα καὶ
ἵππους μάλιστα.
Τοῖσι μὲν δὴ ἄλλοισι τῶν θεῶν οὕτω θύουσι καὶ ταῦτα τῶν 62

---

60. 1. **θυσίη.** Sacrificial rite: differing from the Greek uses.

πάντα. Except for Ares, c. 62 *infra.*

ἱρά. Offerings, c. 33 *supra*; cp. L. & S. *sub v.* III.

2. **αὐτό,** 'by itself.'

4. **τὴν ἀρχὴν τ. σ.** 'the end of the rope' (with which the victim is bound).

6. **περὶ ὦν ἔβαλε.** A tmesis frequently used by Hdt. with the aorist indicative (2. 172 with participle) to emphasise a sudden or vivid action: very forcible, if he was reading aloud. Cp. 1. 194 *ἀπ' ὦν ἐκήρυξαν*, 2. 39 *ἀπ' ὦν ἔδοντο*, 2. 40 *ἐξ ὦν εἷλον*, 2. 47 *ἀπ' ὦν ἔβαψε* etc. Cp. Stein's note to i.[5] 194.

ἐμβαλών, *sc.* 'into the noose.'

7. **οὔτε καταρξάμενος,** 'not beginning with consecration.' Cp. 2. 45.

61. 4. **Λεσβίοισι.** The shape of the Lesbian krater is not known. As Hdt. does not say anything about putting a cover on these boilers, they were perhaps pot-bellied and narrow-necked.

12. **ἀπαρξάμενος,** c. 188 *infra.* By Homer used with accusative: *τρίχας Il.* 19. 254, *Od.* 14. 422, or absolutely *Od.* 3. 446.

13. **τὰ ἄλλα πρόβατα.** Like *τὰ λοιπὰ νόμαια* c. 59 *supra.*

14. **ἵππους.** Perhaps to Poseidon c. 59 *supra* as well as to Ares c. 62 *infra.* On the pre-eminence and solemnity of the sacrifice of the horse cp. Grimm's *Teutonic Mythology* (tr. Stallybrass) i. 47 ff.: at Rome, to Mars: Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 64. At Rhodes, horses cast into sea as sacrifice to the sun, Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 275. These sacrifices not quite the same as those recorded cc. 71, 72 *infra*, where see notes.

62. The cult of the Sword, Dirk, or Sabre is remarkably like customs of the Alani (Ammianus Marc. 31. 2, 23) and of the Huns, Jordanis, *de reb. G.* 35 (Hansen, § 248). "This word (Akinákes) is erroneously translated 'Scymitar,' a weapon which, in its present shape,

κτηνέων, τῷ δὲ Ἄρεϊ ὧδε. κατὰ νομοὺς ἑκάστους τῶν ἀρχέων ἐσίδρυταί σφι Ἄρεος ἱρὸν τοιόνδε· φρυγάνων φάκελοι συννενέαται ὅσον τ᾽ ἐπὶ σταδίους τρεῖς μῆκος καὶ εὖρος, ὕψος δὲ ἔλασσον· ἄνω δὲ τούτου τετράγωνον ἄπεδον πεποίηται, καὶ τὰ μὲν τρία τῶν κώλων ἐστὶ ἀπότομα, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἓν ἐπιβατόν. ἔτεος δὲ ἑκάστου ἁμάξας πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐπινέουσι φρυγάνων· ὑπονοστέει γὰρ δὴ αἰεὶ ὑπὸ τῶν χειμώνων. ἐπὶ τούτου δὴ τοῦ σηκοῦ ἀκινάκης σιδήρεος ἵδρυται ἀρχαῖος ἑκάστοισι, καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι τοῦ Ἄρεος τὸ ἄγαλμα. τούτῳ δὲ τῷ ἀκινάκῃ θυσίας ἐπετείους προσάγουσι προβάτων καὶ ἵππων, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοισίδ᾽ ἔτι πλέω θύουσι ἢ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι θεοῖσι· ὅσους ἂν τῶν πολεμίων ζωγρήσωσι, ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν ἀνδρῶν ἄνδρα θύουσι τρόπῳ οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ πρόβατα, ἀλλ᾽ ἑτεροίῳ. ἐπεὰν γὰρ οἶνον ἐπισπείσωσι κατὰ τῶν κεφαλέων, ἀποσφάζουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐς ἄγγος καὶ ἔπειτα ἀνενείκαντες ἄνω ἐπὶ τὸν ὄγκον τῶν φρυγάνων καταχέουσι τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀκινάκεω. ἄνω μὲν δὴ φορέουσι τοῦτο, κάτω δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἱρὸν ποιεῦσι τάδε· τῶν ἀποσφαγέντων ἀνδρῶν

---

dates from about the rise of El-Islam," R. F. Burton, *The Book of the Sword*, p. 227. In this passage (cc. 62-66) Hdt. takes for granted a political organisation of the Scyths which unfortunately he nowhere describes in detail. There are *ἀρχήια*, perhaps to be identified with the *βασιλήια*, and if so, probably three in number, subdivided into *νομοί* (like Egypt 2. 4, 42, etc.), number not stated, each under a *νομάρχης*, c. 66 *infra*. As each *νομὸς* has an image of the war-god it was perhaps connected with the military organisation and mobilisation. The *βασιλεὺς* reserves the distribution of the spoil and jurisdiction. Cp. c. 64 *infra*. All this implies considerable local settlement and organisation, to a degree inconsistent with the merely nomadic Scythia of the ensuing narrative. It would be an excess of rationalism to argue to a political development in Scythia between the dates of the invasion of Dareios and of the visit of Herodotus, a development of which the historian betrays no consciousness: it is altogether simpler to add the inconsistency to the evidence in favour of a 'contamination' of sources, and against the historic character of the narrative. Cp. Introduction, § 16, III.

3. **ἱρόν.** A temple, or holy place. Cp. cc. 60 *ad init.* and 59 *ad fin.*

τοιόνδε. Canon Rawlinson's note *ad l.* runs: "These measures are utterly incredible. We gather from them that Herodotus had not seen any of these piles, but took the exaggerated accounts of certain mendacious Scythians. How a country *αἰνῶς ἄξυλος* was to furnish such enormous piles of brushwood, he forgets to ask himself." *O si sic omnia!* But there is no sufficient reason for thinking that Herodotus had these accounts from Scythians. Cp. Introduction, § 20.

9. **σιδήρεος.** "The sword in the great tomb at Kertch was [*sic*] of iron, so that Herodotus is perhaps not mistaken" R. Cp. Schräder (tr. Jevons), *Prehistoric Antiquities*, p. 203, *Antiqq. de la Russie mérid.* p. 182.

10. **ἄγαλμα**, 'fetish,' cp. c. 26 *supra*.

11. **τοισίδ' ἔτι πλέω.** Baehr follows Wesseling in taking *τοισίδ'* (or *τοῖσιδ'* with Stein) to mean *acinacibus*, 'to the aforesaid sabres.' Krüger suggested tentatively *um folgendes mehr*, *i.e.* with the following, or, 'as follows.' This is endorsed by Stein and Abicht, who adds that *τοισίδ'* is a 'Dative of Difference': whatever that may be. Perhaps Herodotus means: 'they sacrifice to Ares, though not to the other gods, victims in great numbers as follows.' Wine must have been imported. Cp. c. 66 *infra*.

τοὺς δεξιοὺς ὤμους πάντας ἀποταμόντες σὺν τῇσι χερσὶ ἐς τὸν
ἠέρα ἱεῖσι, καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀπέρξαντες ἱρήια ἀπαλλάσ-
σονται. χεὶρ δὲ τῇ ἂν πέσῃ κέεται, καὶ χωρὶς ὁ νεκρός.
θυσίαι μέν νυν αὗταί σφι κατεστᾶσι. ὑσὶ δὲ οὗτοι οὐδὲν 63
νομίζουσι, οὐδὲ τρέφειν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ τὸ παράπαν θέλουσι.

Τὰ δ' ἐς πόλεμον ἔχοντα ὧδέ σφι διακέαται· ἐπεὰν τὸν 64
πρῶτον ἄνδρα καταβάλῃ ἀνὴρ Σκύθης, τοῦ αἵματος ἐμπίνει,
ὅσους δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ ἐν τῇ μάχῃ, τούτων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀποφέρει
τῷ βασιλέι. ἀπενείκας μὲν γὰρ κεφαλὴν τῆς ληίης μετα-
λαμβάνει τὴν ἂν λάβωσι, μὴ ἐνείκας δὲ οὔ. ἀποδείρει δὲ αὐτὴν
τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· περιταμὼν κύκλῳ περὶ τὰ ὦτα καὶ λαβόμενος
τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκσείει, μετὰ δὲ σαρκίσας βοὸς πλευρῇ δέψει τῇσι
χερσί, ὀργάσας δὲ αὐτὸ ἅτε χειρόμακτρον ἔκτηται, ἐκ δὲ τῶν
χαλινῶν τοῦ ἵππου τὸν αὐτὸς ἐλαύνει, ἐκ τούτου ἐξάπτει καὶ
ἀγάλλεται· ὃς γὰρ ἂν πλεῖστα δέρματα χειρόμακτρα ἔχῃ, ἀνὴρ
ἄριστος οὗτος κέκριται. πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀποδαρμάτων
καὶ χλαίνας ἐπείνυσθαι ποιεῦσι, συρράπτοντες κατά περ βαίτας.
πολλοὶ δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐχθρῶν τὰς δεξιὰς χεῖρας νεκρῶν ἐόντων
ἀποδείραντες αὐτοῖσι ὄνυξι καλύπτρας τῶν φαρετρέων ποιεῦνται.

---

63. 1. **ὑσὶ δέ.** If a *καὶ* stood here before *οὗτοι* we should have a plain reference to the Egyptians and their horror of swine, 2. 47, and an indication that this passage was written with reference to that. Stein thinks *καὶ* has dropped out here, and compares c. 76 *infra*. Readers of Strabo will realise what an important rôle was played by the pig in the political or domestic economy of the ancient larder, irrespective of its religious value (cp. Strabo, 192, 218). In Greek ritual the pig is specially sacred to Demeter, and was a mystic and magic animal. Cp. Aristophanes, *Ach.* 765 *et al.*, Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion*, ii. 269, Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 44 ff., Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, i. 50 ff., Robertson Smith, *Religion of Semites*, p. 272, Ramsay, *Asia Minor*, pp. 31 ff.

64. 2. **ἐμπίνει.** No doubt with the idea of imbibing his strength: a common savage notion, see Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 85 ff., Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, ii. 381.

4. **βασιλέι.** See c. 62 *supra*. It was a system of payment by results probably; the more heads the more spoil. On the prevalence and significance of head-hunting *et sim.*, cp. H. Spencer, *Ceremonial Institutions*, § 350.

6. **περιταμών.** *ἀποσκυθίζειν* is explained by Hesychius *περιτεμεῖν*, which in general means to circumcise. Steph. Byz. has a gloss, *τῷ σιδήρῳ τὰς τρίχας τεμεῖν*, and this is the sense in which the word is used by Euripides and Athenaeus, 524 f. The Scyths wore their hair long, *vid.* Rawlinson, c. 71, n. 7. Suidas however explains: *τὸ ἐπιτεμεῖν τὸ ἐπικεφάλιον δέρμα σὺν θριξίν*: and the widespread and notorious practice of scalping makes Hdt.'s report probable. Cp. on Scalping, H. Spencer, *Ceremonial Institutions*, § 352.

9. **τούτου.** We might have expected *τούτων*. Cp. *τὰ λίνεα, τοῦ* 7. 36.

12. **βαίτας.** Sheep- or goat-skin cloaks. *Ἀττικοὶ δὲ ταύτην καὶ σισύραν φασί*, Schol. Theocrit. 5. 12. Books have been bound in modern times in human skin: but it would hardly have been a good protection against a Scythic winter. *Five* arrows make a quiverfull among the Mongols (Neumann, p. 305) and this was the number presented to Dareios, c. 131 *infra*, perhaps one for each finger.

δέρμα δὲ ἀνθρώπου καὶ παχὺ καὶ λαμπρὸν ἦν ἄρα, σχεδὸν δερμάτων πάντων λαμπρότατον λευκότητι. πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ὅλους ἄνδρας ἐκδείραντες καὶ διατείναντες ἐπὶ ξύλων ἐπ' ἵππων περι-
65 φέρουσι. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω σφι νενόμισται, αὐτὰς δὲ τὰς κεφαλάς, οὔτι πάντων ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐχθίστων, ποιεῦσι τάδε· ἀποπρίσας [ἕκαστος] πᾶν τὸ ἔνερθε τῶν ὀφρύων ἐκκαθαίρει· καὶ ἢν μὲν ᾖ πένης, ὁ δὲ ἔξωθεν ὠμοβοέην μούνην περιτείνας οὕτω χρᾶται, ἢν δὲ ᾖ πλούσιος, τὴν μὲν ὠμοβοέην περιτείνει, ἔσωθεν δὲ καταχρυσώσας οὕτω χρᾶται ποτηρίῳ. ποιεῦσι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκηίων ἤν σφι διάφοροι γένωνται καὶ ἢν ἐπικρατήσῃ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῷ βασιλέι. ξείνων δέ οἱ ἐλθόντων τῶν ἂν λόγον ποιέηται, τὰς κεφαλὰς ταύτας παραφέρει καὶ ἐπιλέγει ὥς οἱ ἐόντες οἰκήιοι πόλεμον προσεθήκαντο καί σφεων αὐτὸς ἐπε-
66 κράτησε, ταύτην ἀνδραγαθίην λέγοντες. ἅπαξ δὲ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἑκάστου ὁ νομάρχης ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἑωυτοῦ νομῷ κιρνᾷ κρητῆρα οἴνου, ἀπ' οὗ πίνουσι τῶν Σκυθέων τοῖσι ἂν ἄνδρες πολέμιοι ἀραιρημένοι ἔωσι· τοῖσι δ' ἂν μὴ κατεργασμένον ᾖ τοῦτο, οὐ γεύονται τοῦ οἴνου τούτου, ἀλλ' ἠτιμωμένοι ἀποκατέαται· ὄνειδος δέ σφί ἐστι μέγιστον τοῦτο. ὅσοι δὲ ἂν αὐτῶν καὶ κάρτα πολλοὺς ἄνδρας ἀραιρηκότες ἔωσι, οὗτοι δὲ σύνδυο κύλικας ἔχοντες πίνουσι ὁμοῦ.

67 Μάντιες δὲ Σκυθέων εἰσὶ πολλοί, οἳ μαντεύονται ῥάβδοισι

---

15. **ἦν.** Hdt. does not actually say that he had seen any such quiver, with a cover of human skin, and the ἦν ἄρα need not suggest at most more than 'is as I was told.'

16. **πολλοὶ** Rawlinson mistranslates 'some,' feeling perhaps that the custom cannot have been very common!

65. 3. **ἕκαστος** Krüger brackets as a gloss.

ἐκκαθαίρει, *sc.* the remainder, or skull.

4. **δέ.** *In apodosi*, very common with Hdt. Cp. Madvig, *Syntax*, § 188, Monro, *Homeric Gr.* § 334.

7. **ἢν ἐπικρατήσῃ αὐτοῦ**, 'if the one get the better of the other,' the chief acts as judge, or umpire.

8. **ξείνων κτλ.** One need not argue from this that Hdt. had gone among the Scyths or been made much of and seen these cups: it might all be from mere hear-say, or other authority.

66. 2. **ὁ νομάρχης.** See c. 62 *supra*.

3. **οἴνου.** No doubt Greek: Lesbian, Thasian, Samian, or what not: cp. c. 62 *supra*. It might be conjectured that this annual drink was connected with the sacrifice there described. It was perhaps these drinking bouts which earned the Scyths a bad reputation, especially with each hero *drinking from two cups at the same time!* cp. 6. 64 *infra*. All the more remarkable is the doctrine or criticism on Bacchos ascribed to the Scyths, c. 79 *infra*.

7. **σύνδυο κύλικας . . ὁμοῦ.** Schweig. originally followed Valckenaer in rendering *juncta bina pocula habentes*, but afterwards adopted the version above given, which has been followed by Baehr, Krüger, Stein, and others. The statement, then, cannot be accepted quite literally. Could the meaning be that the drinkers in question have cups twice as big as those of the others, which are filled and emptied just as often?

67. 1. **μάντιες.** This passage on the Scythian mantic and oaths might have been expected to follow immediately on the religion, from which it is now separated by the notice of τὰ ἐς πόλεμον ἔχοντα. The separation marks, though

ἰτεΐνῃσι πολλῇσι ὧδε· ἐπεὰν φακέλους ῥάβδων μεγάλους ἐνείκων-
ται, θέντες χαμαὶ διεξειλίσσουσι αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπὶ μίαν ἑκάστην
ῥάβδον τιθέντες θεσπίζουσι, ἅμα τε λέγοντες ταῦτα συνειλέουσι
τὰς ῥάβδους ὀπίσω καὶ αὖτις κατὰ μίαν συντιθεῖσι. αὕτη μέν
σφι ἡ μαντικὴ πατρωίη ἐστί. οἱ δὲ Ἐνάρεες οἱ ἀνδρόγυνοι τὴν
Ἀφροδίτην σφίσι λέγουσι μαντικὴν δοῦναι· φιλύρης δ' ὦν
φλοιῷ μαντεύονται· ἐπεὰν τὴν φιλύρην τρίχα σχίσῃ, διαπλέκων
ἐν τοῖσι δακτύλοισι τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ καὶ διαλύων χρᾷ. ἐπεὰν δὲ 68
βασιλεὺς ὁ Σκυθέων κάμῃ, μεταπέμπεται τῶν μαντίων ἄνδρας
τρεῖς τοὺς εὐδοκιμέοντας μάλιστα, οἳ τρόπῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ μαν-
τεύονται· καὶ λέγουσι οὗτοι ὡς τὸ ἐπίπαν μάλιστα τάδε, ὡς τὰς
βασιληίας ἱστίας ἐπιώρκηκε ὃς καὶ ὅς, λέγοντες τῶν ἀστῶν τὸν
ἂν δὴ λέγωσι. τὰς δὲ βασιληίας ἱστίας νόμος Σκύθῃσι τὰ
μάλιστά ἐστι ὀμνύναι τότε ἐπεὰν τὸν μέγιστον ὅρκον ἐθέλωσι
ὀμνύναι. αὐτίκα δὲ διαλελαμμένος ἄγεται οὗτος τὸν ἂν δὴ
φῶσι ἐπιορκῆσαι, ἀπιγμένον δὲ ἐλέγχουσι οἱ μάντιες ὡς ἐπιορ-
κήσας φαίνεται ἐν τῇ μαντικῇ τὰς βασιληίας ἱστίας καὶ διὰ
ταῦτα ἀλγέει ὁ βασιλεύς· ὁ δὲ ἀρνέεται, οὐ φάμενος ἐπιορ-
κῆσαι, καὶ δεινολογέεται. ἀρνεομένου δὲ τούτου ὁ βασιλεὺς
μεταπέμπεται ἄλλους διπλησίους μάντιας· καὶ ἢν μὲν καὶ οὗτοι

---

not perhaps by Hdt.'s conscious design, the difference between theologic ritual and divination. The rhabdomancy of the Scythians approaches witchcraft, and had probably nothing to say to their *θυσίη*. It is not described in perfectly clear language, and it may reasonably be doubted whether Hdt. ever assisted at the performance.

3. **ἐπὶ μίαν.** Krüger suggests *μίαν ἐπὶ μίαν* as *ἐπὶ μίαν* is grammatically inexplicable. *κατὰ μίαν infra* Stein takes as a mere variation for *ἐπὶ μίαν*. The obvious sense required by the performance is that the diviners undo a bundle of rods, use the rods one by one, and then do up the rods into one bundle again. Transposing *ἐπὶ* and *κατὰ* might mend the passage.

5. **ὀπίσω** seems here = *πάλιν* and not 'behind their backs'! (Neumann, p. 265.) Cp. c. 71 *infra*.

6. **οἱ Ἐνάρεες.** Cp. 1. 105.

οἱ ἀνδρόγυνοι looks like a gloss.

There are three chief theories in regard to the *θήλεια νοῦσος*, that it was a vice, that it was a malady of the body, that it was a mental affliction. The three are one. The whole question is exhaustively treated in Rosenbaum's *Gesch. der Lustseuche im Alterthume*, pp. 141-219. Bouhier, *Recherches, etc.* (1746), c. xx. is still worth consulting. Hansen, *Ost-Europa*, § 223, suggests that Hippokrates (*de Aere*, §§ 107 ff.) in his polemic against the superstitious (supernatural) explanation of the Scythian impotence has Hdt. (1. 105) in memory. But it is not certain that Hdt. was the only or the earliest authority for that story, and the combination of facts implied in it.

68. 2. **ὁ Σκυθέων.** Curious, as there were three kings, cp. cc. 65 *supra*, 102, 120 *infra*.

5. **ἱστίας.** The plural here is explained by Stein as referring to the polygamy of the king, who might have as many hearths as wives: or is it not rather due to there being several kings? Or is it, perhaps, connected with the worship of the dead kings? (R. renders it as singular: and so too Macaulay.)

8. **διαλελαμμένος** = *ἑκατέρωθεν λελαμμένος*. Cp. *διαλαβεῖν* 1. 114, certainly more explicit than the commoner *συλλαβεῖν*. Aristoph. *Eccles.* 1090 has *διαλελημμένον* of a person held by two others, one on either side.

ἐσορῶντες ἐς τὴν μαντικὴν καταδήσωσι ἐπιορκῆσαι, τοῦ δὲ ἰθέως τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτάμνουσι, καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ διαλαγχάνουσι οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν μαντίων· ἢν δὲ οἱ ἐπελθόντες μάντιες ἀπολύσωσι, ἄλλοι πάρεισι μάντιες καὶ μάλα ἄλλοι. ἢν ὦν οἱ πλεῦνες τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀπολύσωσι, δέδοκται τοῖσι πρώτοισι τῶν μαντίων αὐτοῖσι ἀπόλλυσθαι. ἀπολλῦσι δῆτα αὐτοὺς τρόπῳ
69 τοιῷδε· ἐπεὰν ἅμαξαν φρυγάνων πλήσωσι καὶ ὑποζεύξωσι βοῦς, ἐμποδίσαντες τοὺς μάντιας καὶ χεῖρας ὀπίσω δήσαντες καὶ στομώσαντες κατεργνῦσι ἐς μέσα τὰ φρύγανα, ὑποπρήσαντες δὲ αὐτὰ ἀπιεῖσι φοβήσαντες τοὺς βοῦς. πολλοὶ μὲν δὴ συγκατακαίονται τοῖσι μάντισι βόες, πολλοὶ δὲ περικεκαυμένοι ἀποφεύγουσι, ἐπεὰν αὐτῶν ὁ ῥυμὸς κατακαυθῇ. κατακαίουσι δὲ τρόπῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ καὶ δι' ἄλλας αἰτίας τοὺς μάντιας, ψευδομάντιας καλέοντες. τοὺς δ' ἂν ἀποκτείνῃ βασιλεύς, τούτων οὐδὲ τοὺς παῖδας λείπει, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ ἔρσενα κτείνει, τὰ δὲ θήλεα οὐκ ἀδικέει.

70 Ὅρκια δὲ ποιεῦνται Σκύθαι ὧδε πρὸς τοὺς ἂν ποιέωνται· ἐς κύλικα μεγάλην κεραμίνην οἶνον ἐγχέαντες αἷμα συμμίσγουσι τῶν τὸ ὅρκιον ταμνομένων, τύψαντες ὑπέατι ἢ ἐπιταμόντες μαχαίρῃ σμικρὸν τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἔπειτα ἀποβάψαντες ἐς τὴν κύλικα ἀκινάκην καὶ ὀιστοὺς καὶ σάγαριν καὶ ἀκόντιον· ἐπεὰν δὲ ταῦτα ποιήσωσι, κατεύχονται πολλὰ καὶ ἔπειτα ἀποπίνουσι αὐτοί τε οἱ τὸ ὅρκιον ποιεύμενοι καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων οἱ πλείστου ἄξιοι.

71 Ταφαὶ δὲ τῶν βασιλέων ἐν Γέρροισι εἰσὶ [ἐς ὃ ὁ Βορυσθένης

---

69. 1. **βοῦς.** Horses, of which there were so many (c. 28 *supra*), were only used for riding, cc. 122, 129 *infra*, and for sacrifice, c. 61 *supra*.

9. **ἔρσενα.** Cp. 1. 155, where no doubt Kroisos (Hdt.) is thinking of the proverbial line of Stasinos: *νήπιος ὃς πατέρα κτείνας παῖδας καταλείπει*, Arist. *Rh.* 3. 21. This was a wisdom widely recognised in antiquity (cp. 3. 119).

θήλεα. Were the Scyths endogamous? and patriarchically organised? Cp. c. 76 *infra*.

70. 1. **ὅρκια.** The method of plighting faith by drawing, exchanging, or drinking each other's blood, was not confined to the Scyths (cp. 1. 74, 3. 8), and is still common in Africa. Two ideas may be detected in it: the recognition of the blood as the life (*Blut is ein ganz besondrer Saft!* Mephistopheles to Faust), and the purpose of memorialising the act of troth by a vivid ceremony. Cp. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 296 ff. and esp. Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant* (New York, 1885), cited *ibid.*

2. **κεραμίνην.** Was it broken after the ceremony?

οἶνον, c. 66 *supra*.

3. **ὑπέατι.** An Aeolic form not recognised by L. & S. Attic *ὄπεας* an awl.

5. **ὀιστούς.** Perhaps to the number of five, cp. c. 64 *supra*.

71. 1. **ἐς . . προσπλωτός.** The sentence is bracketed by Stein on the grounds (1) that *προσπλωτὸς* implies that there are obstacles to navigation in the Borysthenes (higher up) which Hdt. nowhere [else] recognises: had he known of them he would have mentioned them, c. 53. (2) That Gerrhos is placed 40 days up the river, whereas the Dniepr is only navigable 14 to 15 days up. This argu-

ἐστι προσπλωτός]· ἐνθαῦτα, ἐπεάν σφι ἀποθάνῃ ὁ βασιλεύς, ὄρυγμα γῆς μέγα ὀρύσσουσι τετράγωνον, ἕτοιμον δὲ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες ἀναλαμβάνουσι τὸν νεκρόν, κατακεκηρωμένον μὲν τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ νηδὺν ἀνασχισθεῖσαν καὶ καθαρθεῖσαν, πλέην κυπέρου κεκομμένου καὶ θυμιήματος καὶ σελίνου σπέρματος καὶ ἀννήσου, συνερραμμένην ὀπίσω, καὶ κομίζουσι ἐν ἁμάξῃ ἐς ἄλλο ἔθνος. οἳ δὲ ἂν παραδέξωνται κομισθέντα τὸν νεκρόν, ποιεῦσι τά περ οἱ βασιλήιοι Σκύθαι· τοῦ ὠτὸς ἀποτάμνονται, τρίχας περικείρονται, βραχίονας περιτάμνονται, μέτωπον καὶ ῥῖνα καταμύσσονται, διὰ τῆς ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς ὀιστοὺς διαβυνέονται. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ κομίζουσι ἐν τῇ ἁμάξῃ τοῦ βασιλέος τὸν νέκυν ἐς ἄλλο ἔθνος τῶν ἄρχουσι· οἱ δέ σφι ἕπονται ἐς τοὺς πρότερον ἦλθον. ἐπεὰν δὲ πάντας περιέλθωσι τὸν νέκυν κομίζοντες, ἔν τε Γέρροισι ἔσχατα κατοικημένοισί εἰσι τῶν ἐθνέων τῶν ἄρχουσι καὶ ἐν τῇσι ταφῇσι. καὶ ἔπειτα, ἐπεὰν θέωσι τὸν νέκυν ἐν τῇσι θήκῃσι ἐπὶ στιβάδος, παραπήξαντες αἰχμὰς ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν τοῦ νεκροῦ ξύλα ὑπερτείνουσι καὶ ἔπειτα ῥιψὶ καταστεγάζουσι, ἐν δὲ τῇ λοιπῇ εὐρυχωρίῃ τῆς θήκης τῶν παλλακέων τε μίαν ἀποπνίξαντες θάπτουσι καὶ τὸν οἰνοχόον καὶ μάγειρον καὶ ἱπποκόμον καὶ διήκονον καὶ ἀγγελιηφόρον καὶ ἵππους καὶ

---

ment is not quite conclusive, seeing that the second ground implies accurate knowledge, and the first implies systematic exposition, two characteristics which Hdt. does not possess. There is also the possibility of reading *τεσσερακαίδεκα* for *τεσσεράκοντα* in c. 53 *supra*. Nevertheless the phrase comes in here very unnecessarily, the passage reads better without it, and it may very well be a grammarian's insertion.

2. **ὁ βασιλεύς.** Cp. c. 68 *supra*. This royal *ταρίχευσις* is enough to transport the reader back to Egypt, 2. 86. Rudimentary embalming may not be beyond the resources of primitive culture. Cp. Helbig, *Hom. Epos*,[1] pp. 41 f. Were the ingredients native or imported? Cp. note c. 75 *infra*.

7. **συν. ὀπ.** Cp. 2. 86 *συρράπτουσι ὀπίσω*, *i.e.* *πάλιν*.

9. **οἱ β. Σ.** Presumably the same who are called c. 20 *supra* *Σκ. οἱ ἄριστοί τε καὶ πλεῖστοι*.

τοῦ ὠτός. Not the whole of it.

10. **τρίχας.** The Scyths wore their hair long, *vid.* c. 64 *supra*. On such mutilations cp. Spencer, *Ceremonial Institutions*, c. iii.

13. **οἱ . . ἦλθον.** So that on each stage they are accompanied by two *ἔθνη*.

Dr. M'Pherson found skeletons in graves at Kertch "enveloped in seaweed" and Rawlinson suggests that the mattresses at Gerrhos (40 days inland!) were of this material. For plans and descriptions of Scythic tombs see Dubois de Montpéreux, *Voyage autour du Caucase*, vol. v. and Atlas IV. xviii. Cp. *Antiqq. du Bosphore Cimmérien* (1854), re-edited by S. Reinach, 1892, and *Antiqq. de la Russie méridionale*, now publishing (1891 ff.).

16. **τῶν ἄρχουσι.** Really, or only in their own conceit? Cp. c. 20 *supra*.

18. **ῥιψί.** The tombs found in the south have stone walls and roof.

19. **τῶν παλλακέων . . χρυσέας.** Such practices based upon animistic beliefs are widespread, cp. Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, i. 458 ff., H. Spencer, *Sociology*, i. § 84, 103, 104, etc.; cp. c. 94 *infra*. They may be distinguished from human and other sacrifices offered to immortal deities, the motive or theory of which is, or becomes, different. (For, according to one theory, "the oldest form of sacrifice is the worship of the dead," Schräder-Jevons, *op. cit.* p. 409.) On Sacrifice see

τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἀπαρχὰς καὶ φιάλας χρυσέας· ἀργύρῳ δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ χαλκῷ χρέωνται. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες χοῦσι πάντες χῶμα μέγα, ἁμιλλώμενοι καὶ προθυμεόμενοι ὡς μέγιστον ποιῆσαι.

72 ἐνιαυτοῦ δὲ περιφερομένου αὖτις ποιεῦσι τοιόνδε· λαβόντες τῶν λοιπῶν θεραπόντων τοὺς ἐπιτηδεοτάτους (οἱ δέ εἰσι Σκύθαι ἐγγενέες· οὗτοι γὰρ θεραπεύουσι τοὺς ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς κελεύσῃ, ἀργυρώνητοι δὲ οὐκ εἰσί σφι θεράποντες), τούτων ὦν τῶν διηκόνων ἐπεὰν ἀποπνίξωσι πεντήκοντα καὶ ἵππους τοὺς καλλίστους πεντήκοντα, ἐξελόντες αὐτῶν τὴν κοιλίην καὶ καθήραντες ἐμπιπλᾶσι ἀχύρων καὶ συρράπτουσι. ἁψῖδος δὲ ἥμισυ ἐπὶ δύο ξύλα στήσαντες ὕπτιον καὶ τὸ ἕτερον ἥμισυ τῆς ἁψῖδος ἐπ' ἕτερα δύο, καταπήξαντες τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ πολλὰ ταῦτα, ἔπειτα τῶν ἵππων κατὰ τὰ μήκεα ξύλα παχέα διελάσαντες μέχρι τῶν τραχήλων ἀναβιβάζουσι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς ἁψῖδας· τῶν δὲ αἱ μὲν πρότεραι ἁψῖδες ὑπέχουσι τοὺς ὤμους τῶν ἵππων, αἱ δὲ ὄπισθε παρὰ τοὺς μηροὺς τὰς γαστέρας ὑπολαμβάνουσι· σκέλεα δὲ ἀμφότερα κατακρέμαται μετέωρα. χαλινοὺς δὲ καὶ στόμια ἐμβαλόντες ἐς τοὺς ἵππους κατατείνουσι ἐς τὸ πρόσθε αὐτῶν καὶ ἔπειτα ἐκ πασσάλων δέουσι. τῶν δὲ δὴ νεηνίσκων τῶν ἀποπεπνιγμένων τῶν πεντήκοντα ἕνα ἕκαστον ἀναβιβάζουσι ἐπὶ τὸν ἵππον, ὧδε ἀναβιβάζοντες, ἐπεὰν νεκροῦ ἑκάστου παρὰ τὴν ἄκανθαν ξύλον ὀρθὸν διελάσωσι μέχρι τοῦ τραχήλου· κάτωθεν δὲ ὑπερέχει τοῦ ξύλου τούτου τὸ ἐς τόρμον πηγνύουσι τοῦ ἑτέρου ξύλου τοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἵππου. ἐπιστήσαντες δὲ κύκλῳ τὸ σῆμα ἱππέας τοιούτους ἀπελαύνουσι.

---

esp. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.* cc. (Lectures) vi. ff.

22. **ἀργύρῳ.** When Blakesley says that "this must mean that they do not use either silver or bronze in commerce, for their arms would doubtless be of the latter" he acquits Hdt. of an error by making him guilty of an inconsequence—commerce not being here on the tapis. The obvious meaning is that silver and bronze (cups) were not included in the royal tombs.

72. 1. **ἐνιαυτοῦ.** How nomads measured the year Herodotus does not directly or indirectly indicate. (Cp. c. 98 *infra*.) That the ghastly description which follows is not all a mere traveller's tale is proved *inter alia* by S. Lee, *Ibn Batuta*, London, 1829, p. 220. Blakesley, note *ad l.*, quotes (without references) the Arabian traveller's report of the burial of the Khan of the Tartars, and also a remarkable parallel in the description of a Patagonian funeral reported by Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Beagle*, ii. 155.

It is interesting to compare the quiet way in which Hdt. reports this spectacle with the rhapsody in which Neumann, *op. c.* pp. 234 f., repels indignantly the horrible suggestion that the Scythian custom here described has some analogy with primitive German practices.

It is not to be supposed for one moment that Hdt. himself beheld either this rite or its objects. Unfortunately we do not know exactly when the last Scyth 'King' died before Hdt. wrote the Scythian Logi, or how long it was since a proper opportunity had been afforded of celebrating a King's obsequies, or getting a special report of them.

5. **ἀποπνίξωσι.** There was no bloodshed as of enemies: and the performance is apparently not propitiatory.

Οὕτω μὲν τοὺς βασιλέας θάπτουσι· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Σκύθας, 73
ἐπεὰν ἀποθάνωσι, περιάγουσι οἱ ἀγχοτάτω προσήκοντες κατὰ
τοὺς φίλους ἐν ἁμάξῃσι κειμένους· τῶν δὲ ἕκαστος ὑποδεκόμενος
εὐωχέει τοὺς ἑπομένους, καὶ τῷ νεκρῷ ἁπάντων παραπλησίως
παρατίθησι ὅσα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι. ἡμέρας δὲ τεσσεράκοντα οὕτω
οἱ ἰδιῶται περιάγονται, ἔπειτα θάπτονται. θάψαντες δὲ οἱ
Σκύθαι καθαίρονται τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. σμησάμενοι τὰς κεφαλὰς
καὶ ἐκπλυνάμενοι ποιεῦσι περὶ τὸ σῶμα τάδε· ἐπεὰν ξύλα
στήσωσι τρία ἐς ἄλληλα κεκλιμένα, περὶ ταῦτα πίλους εἰρινέους
περιτείνουσι, συμφράξαντες δὲ ὡς μάλιστα λίθους ἐκ πυρὸς
διαφανέας ἐσβάλλουσι ἐς σκάφην κειμένην ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ξύλων
τε καὶ τῶν πίλων. ἔστι δέ σφι κάνναβις φυομένη ἐν τῇ χώρῃ 74
πλὴν παχύτητος καὶ μεγάθεος τῷ λίνῳ ἐμφερεστάτη· ταύτῃ δὲ
πολλῷ ὑπερφέρει ἡ κάνναβις. αὕτη καὶ αὐτομάτη καὶ σπειρομένη
φύεται, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς Θρήικες μὲν καὶ εἵματα ποιεῦνται τοῖσι
λινέοισι ὁμοιότατα· οὐδ' ἄν, ὅστις μὴ κάρτα τρίβων εἴη αὐτῆς,
διαγνοίη λίνου ἢ καννάβιός ἐστι· ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω τὴν κανναβίδα,
λίνεον δοκήσει εἶναι τὸ εἷμα. ταύτης ὦν οἱ Σκύθαι τῆς καννάβιος 75
τὸ σπέρμα ἐπεὰν λάβωσι, ὑποδύνουσι ὑπὸ τοὺς πίλους, καὶ ἔπειτα
ἐπιβάλλουσι τὸ σπέρμα ἐπὶ τοὺς διαφανέας λίθους τῷ πυρί· τὸ
δὲ θυμιᾶται ἐπιβαλλόμενον καὶ ἀτμίδα παρέχεται τοσαύτην ὥστε
Ἑλληνικὴ οὐδεμία ἄν μιν πυρίη ἀποκρατήσειε. οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι
ἀγάμενοι τῇ πυρίῃ ὠρύονται. τοῦτό σφι ἀντὶ λουτροῦ ἐστι· οὐ

---

73. 4. **καὶ τῷ νεκρῷ.** A genuine touch of animism, but not of course proving that Hdt. had ever assisted at these *wakes.* How the forty days were measured is unfortunately not indicated: cp. c. 72 *supra.*

7. **καθαίρονται.** It was surely not only when a death had occurred in the family that the vapour bath was used: but it is obvious that Hdt. himself had never indulged in the Scythian form of this luxury.

τὰς κεφαλάς. Perhaps they contented themselves with putting dust on their heads, without cutting off their hair for their relatives.

74. 6. **ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω.** Upon this Canon Rawlinson remarks that Hdt. speaks like an eye-witness. But if so, what did Hdt. see? To have seen hemp, or flax, growing in Scythia would not have helped any one to distinguish a hempen from a linen garment, worn, moreover, by a *Thracian.* Hdt. had apparently seen one or more of these Thracian *Himatia*, and perhaps not being a connoisseur had mistaken it for linen, until the difference was pointed out to him. Thracians were to be found out of Thrace, and the Scythian cannabis was presumably exported: in any case the passage proves nothing in regard to Hdt. in Scythia. On the formula cp. cc. 81, 99 *infra*, and Introduction, § 20.

75. 6. **ἀγάμενοι τῇ πυρίῃ ὠρύονται.** The words are saner than the behaviour they describe. Desperate attempts to amend the text seem to proceed from an oversight of the consideration adduced in the note next but one below. We need not, however, infer that Hdt. had heard Scythians howling. Cp. c. 189 *infra.*

πυρίῃ. On Greek bathing consult Becker's *Charikles*, Scene 8, Excursus 3 (vol. iii. pp. 98 ff. Calvary's ed. 1878).

ἀντὶ λουτροῦ. "Hdt. appears in this instance to have confounded to-

γὰρ δὴ λούονται ὕδατι τὸ παράπαν τὸ σῶμα. αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν ὕδωρ παραχέουσαι κατασώχουσι περὶ λίθον τρηχὺν τῆς κυπαρίσσου καὶ κέδρου καὶ λιβάνου ξύλου, καὶ ἔπειτα τὸ κατασωχόμενον τοῦτο παχὺ ἐὸν καταπλάσσονται πᾶν τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον· καὶ ἅμα μὲν εὐωδίη σφέας ἀπὸ τούτου ἴσχει, ἅμα δὲ ἀπαιρέουσαι τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ τὴν καταπλαστὺν γίνονται καθαραὶ καὶ λαμπραί.

76 Ξεινικοῖσι δὲ νομαίοισι καὶ οὗτοι φεύγουσι αἰνῶς χρᾶσθαι, μήτε τέων ἄλλων, Ἑλληνικοῖσι δὲ καὶ ἥκιστα, ὡς διέδεξαν Ἀνάχαρσίς τε καὶ δεύτερα αὖτις Σκύλης. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ Ἀνάχαρσις ἐπείτε γῆν πολλὴν θεωρήσας καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος κατ' αὐτὴν σοφίην πολλὴν ἐκομίζετο ἐς ἤθεα τὰ Σκυθέων, πλέων δι' Ἑλλησπόντου προσίσχει ἐς Κύζικον· καὶ εὗρε γὰρ τῇ μητρὶ τῶν

---

gether two things in reality quite distinct, viz. intoxication from the fumes of hemp-seed, and indulgence in the vapour bath" Rawlinson. There is in fact nothing in this chapter from first to last that betrays the eye-witness.

9. **κυπαρίσσου.** Cypress grows in the Crimea, but cedar and frankincense must have been imports. Cp. c. 71 *supra*.

τὸ κατασωχόμενον . . τὸ σῶμα. The two accusatives are irregular.

76. 1. **καὶ οὗτοι** seems a clear reference to 2. 91, cp. c. 63 *supra*.

2. **μήτε τέων** (τεῶν St.). The reading of the MSS. is μήτε or μή τι or μὴ τοί γε ὦν which Stein corrects as in the text, and explains that οὐκ ἐθέλουσι may be suggested by φεύγουσι. *Locus insanabilis* van Herwerden.

3. **Ἀνάχαρσις.** Baehr and Holder read Ἀναχάρσι and Σκύλῃ not without MSS. authority, and certainly with literary force. Anacharsis (cp. c. 46 *supra*) became to the Greeks the type of an intelligent foreigner, and (like Goldsmith's Chinese citizen, *et simil. mutatis mutandis*) the mouth-piece of a great deal of criticism on things Hellenic. His figure has had a long life in literature from Herodotus and Plato to Lucian, Stobaeus, Suidas and—Abbé Jean Jacques Barthélemy (*Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce*, Paris 1788). He was represented as a contemporary and friend of Solon, Periandros, and the Laconian Myson (cp. Plat. *Protag.* 343), as one of the visitors to Kroisos, as a poet, letterwriter, and inventor (see esp. Suidas, *sub v.*, Cicero, *Tusc.* 5. 32, Diog. L. 1. 105). A number of more or less authentic sayings of his of a Laconic character were preserved, Diog. L. 1. 102, and elsewhere. Cp. Smith's *Dict. Biogr.* i. 157, where A. is erroneously called a Thracian.

Σκύλης, c. 78 *infra*.

6. **Ἑλλησπόντου.** In an extended sense. He was in the Propontis, on his way homewards, cp. c. 14 *supra*.

Anacharsis was still perhaps remembered and spoken of in Kyzikos as was Aristeas (c. 14 *supra*), but Hdt. would not have had to go to Kyzikos to hear his romantic story, and Kyzikos might have been introduced into the story as the place where Anacharsis would probably have seen the ritual of Kybele—in his time therefore unknown in Scythia (cp. c. 53 *supra*), even though the Phoenician Aphrodite had reached that shore, c. 59 *supra*. Kyzikos was one of the chief centres of the worship of the Mother, who had a temple on Mount Dindymon close by the town (Strabo, 575): not to be confounded with the greater mountain of the same name, in Galatia, or ancient Phrygia, by Pessinus, the chief seat of the Asiatic Mother (Agdistis or Dindymene, cp. 1. 80). Doubtless at Kyzikos the cultus was of a highly orgiastic kind. The Μητρῷον at Athens was dedicated to the same goddess, and Preller, *Gr. Myth.* i.[3] p. 537, very plausibly suggests that the introduction of the cult at Athens may be connected with the age and policy of Peisistratos: any way it was not at Athens that Anacharsis was initiated. Perhaps the more orgiastic rite was not popular at Athens until after the Pelo-

θεῶν ἀνάγοντας τοὺς Κυζικηνοὺς ὁρτὴν μεγαλοπρεπέως κάρτα, εὔξατο τῇ μητρὶ ὁ Ἀνάχαρσις, ἢν σῶς καὶ ὑγιὴς ἀπονοστήσῃ ἐς ἑωυτοῦ, θύσειν τε κατὰ ταὐτὰ κατὰ ὥρα τοὺς Κυζικηνοὺς ποιεῦντας καὶ παννυχίδα στήσειν. ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Σκυθικήν, καταδὺς ἐς τὴν καλεομένην Ὑλαίην (ἡ δ' ἔστι μὲν παρὰ τὸν Ἀχιλλήιον δρόμον, τυγχάνει δὲ πᾶσα ἐοῦσα δενδρέων παντοίων πλέη), ἐς ταύτην δὴ καταδὺς ὁ Ἀνάχαρσις τὴν ὁρτὴν ἐπετέλεε πᾶσαν τῇ θεῷ, τύμπανόν τε ἔχων καὶ ἐκδησάμενος ἀγάλματα. καὶ τῶν τις Σκυθέων καταφρασθεὶς αὐτὸν ταῦτα ποιεῦντα ἐσήμηνε τῷ βασιλέι Σαυλίῳ· ὁ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπικόμενος ὡς εἶδε τὸν Ἀνάχαρσιν ποιεῦντα ταῦτα, τοξεύσας αὐτὸν ἀπέκτεινε. καὶ νῦν ἤν τις εἴρηται περὶ Ἀναχάρσιος, οὔ φασί μιν Σκύθαι γινώσκειν, διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι ἐξεδήμησέ τε ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ ξεινικοῖσι ἔθεσι διεχρήσατο. ὡς δ' ἐγὼ ἤκουσα Τύμνεω τοῦ Ἀριαπείθεος ἐπιτρόπου, εἶναι αὐτὸν Ἰδανθύρσου τοῦ Σκυθέων βασιλέος πάτρων, παῖδα δὲ εἶναι Γνούρου τοῦ Λύκου τοῦ Σπαργαπείθεος. εἰ ὦν ταύτης ἦν τῆς οἰκίης ὁ Ἀνάχαρσις, ἴστω ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ

---

ponnesian war, when the rift between the religions of the Few and of the Many was fully developed or revived, and coarser cults again became prominent. (Cp. Aristophanes, *Pax* 420, *Lysistr.* 389 ff., Plato, *Rep. ad init.*, Demosthen. *de Cor.* 322 ff.)

10. **παννυχίδα.** In later days he might have assisted at such a celebration in Athens, cp. Aristoph. *Frogs* 371, 445, and Plato, *Rep.* 328; and for a similar night-watch cp. the Egyptian celebration described 2. 62 and the λαμπαδηφορία 8. 98.

11. **ἡ δ' ἔστι.** It is curious to find this geographical excursus here, embedded in the story of Anacharsis, after cc. 55, 18 *supra*, if we suppose that the whole Scythian λόγος was written continuously and in one vein. This geographical aside suggests a variety of sources.

14. **τύμπανον.** These orgiastic drums were of two kinds, one like a tambourine, the other like a small kettledrum (cp. Smith, *Dict. Antiq.*[2] p. 1180 and L. & S. *sub vv.* τυμπανίζειν, τυμπανισμὸς *et cogn.*). Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, p. 1663[a].

ἀγάλματα. "Imagines suspensas sibi fecerat" Baehr. Little images of the goddess or of Attis, such as those worn by the Galli (Polyb. 22. 20 προστηθίδια καὶ τύπους) or found in Attic graves (Preller, *op. c.* p. 539), hung round his neck. The construction is the not uncommon Greek idiom (cp. Aischines 3. 164 ἐπιστολὰς ἐξηρτημένος, Aristoph. *Eccl.* 494 πώγωνας ἐξηρτημέναι) copied by Horace, *Sat.* 1. 6, 74 suspensi loculos tabulamque.

18. **οὔ φασί μιν Σκύθαι.** It is evident, therefore, that Hdt. did not get the story from a Scythian source, and evident further that Tymnes was no Scyth. The name occurs twice again in Hdt. as that of the father of a Histiaios of Termera in Karia (5. 38, 7. 98), very near Halikarnassos Hdt.'s native city. Where Hdt. met and conversed with this Tymnes, he does not say, but it need not have been in Scythia: it is not even certain that the ἐπιτροπεία of Tymnes involved residence in Scythia, or was exercised there, although a probability to that effect may exist. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

21. **πάτρων.** Here again we have evidence, such as it is, that the patriarchal family was developed among the Scyths, though no doubt polygamous, cp. c. 69 *supra*.

23. **ἴστω.** The dead man is regarded as conscious and capable of being addressed. Stein compares Pausan. 1. 6, 8, which seems an imitation of this passage, not an independent parallel.

ἀποθανών· Ἰδάνθυρσος γὰρ ἦν παῖς Σαυλίου, Σαύλιος δὲ ἦν ὁ
77 ἀποκτείνας Ἀνάχαρσιν. καίτοι τινὰ ἤδη ἤκουσα λόγον ἄλλον ὑπὸ Πελοποννησίων λεγόμενον, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σκυθέων βασιλέος Ἀνάχαρσις ἀποπεμφθεὶς τῆς Ἑλλάδος μαθητὴς γένοιτο, ὀπίσω τε ἀπονοστήσας φαίη πρὸς τὸν ἀποπέμψαντα Ἕλληνας πάντας ἀσχόλους εἶναι ἐς πᾶσαν σοφίην πλὴν Λακεδαιμονίων, τούτοισι δὲ εἶναι μούνοισι σωφρόνως δοῦναί τε καὶ δέξασθαι λόγον. ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν ὁ λόγος ἄλλως πέπλασται ὑπ' αὐτῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὁ δ' ὦν ἀνὴρ ὥσπερ πρότερον εἰρέθη διεφθάρη.

78 Οὗτος μέν νυν οὕτω δὴ ἔπρηξε διὰ ξεινικά τε νόμαια καὶ Ἑλληνικὰς ὁμιλίας. πολλοῖσι δὲ κάρτα ἔτεσι ὕστερον Σκύλης ὁ Ἀριαπείθεος ἔπαθε παραπλήσια τούτῳ. Ἀριαπείθεϊ γὰρ τῷ Σκυθέων βασιλέϊ γίνεται μετ' ἄλλων παίδων Σκύλης· ἐξ Ἰστριηνῆς δὲ γυναικὸς οὗτος γίνεται καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐγχωρίης· τὸν

---

24. **Ἰδάνθυρσος**, c. 120 *infra*.

If Anacharsis was his father's brother, and so a contemporary of Kyros, he might possibly have been a friend of Solon's. Diog. L. 1. 101 and Suidas give the name of the brother as Καδουίδας. Lucian makes the father's name Δαυκέτης (*Scyth.* 4) *γένους τοῦ δοκιμωτάτου ὄντα καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις Σκυθῶν*. Hdt. seems to have a doubt whether Saulios was really his brother.

77. 1. **ἤκουσα**. Hdt. does not actually say that he heard this anecdote in *Sparta*, but internal considerations point to a Spartan origin. There was some tradition at Sparta of a visit from Scythia in the days of Kleomenes (cp. 6. 84 *infra*); and Greeks had a way of making foreigners the vehicles of their criticisms on one another, cp. 1. 153, 2. 160, and perhaps cc. 79, 142 *infra*. Hdt.'s visit to Sparta is certain. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxviii, lxxx f.

2. **ὡς . . ἀποπεμφθεὶς . . γένοιτο.** Mistranslated by R. (and Baehr) "sent to make acquaintance . . ."

3. **τῆς Ἑλλάδος.** Hellas here not a geographical term. Cp. 5. 49.

5. **ἀσχόλους εἶναι ἐς πᾶσαν σοφίην**, "occupied in the pursuit of every kind of knowledge" R.; "busied about every kind of cleverness" Macaulay ("beflissen nach jeglicher Art von Weisheit" Baehr). These translations must all be wrong, the point of the anecdote being to exalt the wisdom (*δοῦναί τε καὶ δέξασθαι λόγον*) as well as the virtue (*σωφρόνως*) of the Spartans. *ἀσχόλους εἶναι* means: 'to have no leisure.' The Greeks were all too busy to attend to higher (unpractical) matters, *σοφία* and *σωφροσύνη*, with the exception of the Lacedaemonians. (Cp. L. & S. *sub vv.* ἀσχολία, ἄσχολος.)

6. **δοῦναι . . λόγον.** Plutarch's Ἀποφθέγματα Λακωνικὰ and Λακαίνων Ἀποφθ. are monuments of Spartan powers in this line, and Hdt. himself supplies us with not a few examples: *e.g.* 5. 51, 72, 6. 50, 67-76 *infra*. Spartan ability did not extend to making set orations (cp. Thuc. 4. 84), although Thucydides has put a long speech or two into the mouths of Spartans (1. 80-86, 4. 17-21, 85-88). Cp. 6. 86 *infra*.

78. 2. **πολλοῖσι κτλ.** One cannot but regret the indefiniteness of this date, for an event which belongs to Hdt.'s own time: cp. Introduction, § 16.

5. **Ἰστριηνῆς.** Of Istria. No doubt from the Istria mentioned in 2. 33 *ad f.* as a colony of Miletos at the mouth of the Danube (Istros). It was on the S. or Thracian side. From the particularity with which the wives of Ariapeithes are distinguished from one another (this Greek lady, the Scythian wife Opoie, and the Thracian), one might argue that Hdt. is correcting some popular error on the subject, the rather as Opoie and Orikos have nothing to do in the story. The taking to wife the deceased king's wives or one of them, might have a political significance. Cp. 2 Sam. 16. 20 ff.

ἡ μήτηρ αὕτη γλῶσσάν τε Ἑλλάδα καὶ γράμματα ἐδίδαξε. μετὰ δὲ χρόνῳ ὕστερον Ἀριαπείθης μὲν τελευτᾷ δόλῳ ὑπὸ Σπαργαπείθεος τοῦ Ἀγαθύρσων βασιλέος, Σκύλης δὲ τήν τε βασιληίην παρέλαβε καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πατρός, τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Ὀποίη· ἦν δὲ αὕτη ἡ Ὀποίη ἀστή, ἐξ ἧς ἦν Ὄρικος Ἀριαπείθεϊ παῖς. βασιλεύων δὲ Σκυθέων ὁ Σκύλης διαίτῃ οὐδαμῶς ἠρέσκετο Σκυθικῇ, ἀλλὰ πολλὸν πρὸς τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μᾶλλον τετραμμένος ἦν ἀπὸ παιδεύσιος τῆς ἐπεπαίδευτο, ἐποίεέ τε τοιοῦτο· εὖτε ἀγάγοι τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν Σκυθέων ἐς τὸ Βορυσθενεϊτέων ἄστυ (οἱ δὲ Βορυσθενεῖται οὗτοι λέγουσι σφέας αὐτοὺς εἶναι Μιλησίους), ἐς τούτους ὅκως ἔλθοι ὁ Σκύλης, τὴν μὲν στρατιὴν καταλίπεσκε ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ, αὐτὸς δὲ ὅκως ἔλθοι ἐς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ τὰς πύλας ἐγκληίσειε, τὴν στολὴν ἀποθέμενος τὴν Σκυθικὴν λάβεσκε ἂν Ἑλληνίδα ἐσθῆτα, ἔχων δ' ἂν ταύτην ἠγόραζε οὔτε δορυφόρων ἑπομένων οὔτε ἄλλου οὐδενός· τὰς δὲ πύλας ἐφύλασσον, μή τίς μιν Σκυθέων ἴδοι ἔχοντα ταύτην τὴν στολήν· καὶ τά τε ἄλλα ἐχρᾶτο διαίτῃ Ἑλληνικῇ καὶ θεοῖσι ἱρὰ ἐποίεε κατὰ νόμους τοὺς Ἑλλήνων. ὅτε δὲ διατρίψειε μῆνα ἢ πλέον τούτου, ἀπαλλάσσετο ἐνδὺς τὴν Σκυθικὴν στολήν. ταῦτα ποιέεσκε πολλάκις καὶ οἰκία τε ἐδείματο ἐν Βορυσθένεϊ καὶ
γυναῖκα ἔγημε ἐς αὐτὰ ἐπιχωρίην. ἐπείτε δὲ ἔδεέ οἱ κακῶς 79
γενέσθαι, ἐγίνετο ἀπὸ προφάσιος τοιῆσδε. ἐπεθύμησε Διονύσῳ Βακχείῳ τελεσθῆναι· μέλλοντι δέ οἱ ἐς χεῖρας ἄγεσθαι τὴν τελετὴν ἐγένετο φάσμα μέγιστον. ἦν οἱ ἐν Βορυσθενεϊτέων τῇ πόλι οἰκίης μεγάλης καὶ πολυτελέος περιβολή, τῆς καὶ ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον τούτων μνήμην εἶχον, τὴν πέριξ λευκοῦ λίθου σφίγγες

---

6. **γλῶσσαν . . γράμματα.** But not Religion?

15. **οἱ δὲ . . Μιλησίους** (cp. c. 17 *supra*) comes in as a curious after-thought if we suppose the story an original and integral portion of the Σκ. λόγοι. The remark is not a gloss, as the construction of the context shows. Cp. c. 76 *supra*.

18. **τὴν στολὴν τ. Σ.** Oddly enough Hdt. nowhere describes the Scythic dress. It included trousers (*ἀναξυρίδες*) Dio Chrys. p. 439, qu. by Stein: and is figured in Rawlinson, and others, after the Crimean finds. Cp. Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, Figure 315 (vol. i. p. 299).

79. 1. **ἐπείτε . . γενέσθαι.** On the formula, cp. Introduction, § 20.

3. **ἐς χ. ἄ.** Cp. 7. 8 *ἐς χ. ἄξεσθαι τὸ στράτευμα*. Cp. 1. 126.

5. **ὀλίγῳ τι πρ.** *i.e.* five lines, cp. c. 16 *supra*.

6. **σφίγγες τε καὶ γρῦπες.** The same combination occurs upon the celebrated François-vase (original in Florence) Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, Tafel lxxiv. vol. iii. 1799 (dated 550-500 B.C.), and a sphinx, with griffins, lay on the helmet of the Chryselephantine Athene of Pheidias (Pausanias, 1. 24, 5). (The modern archaeologists convert these griffins into Pegasi: cp. C. Waldstein, *apud* Baumeister, *op. c. sub v.* PHEIDIAS. For clear representation see *Antiq. de la Russie mérid.* p. 233, after *M.D.I.* 1883, Pl. xv.) Sphinx and griffin alike, in relation to temples, served as guards. Morphologically the chief difference between the winged monsters is that the Greek sphinx has a human head and

τε καὶ γρῦπες ἕστασαν· ἐς ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐνέσκηψε βέλος. καὶ ἡ μὲν κατεκάη πᾶσα, Σκύλης δὲ οὐδὲν τούτου εἵνεκα ἧσσον ἐπετέλεσε τὴν τελετήν. Σκύθαι δὲ τοῦ βακχεύειν πέρι Ἕλλησι ὀνειδίζουσι· οὐ γάρ φασι οἰκὸς εἶναι θεὸν ἐξευρίσκειν τοῦτον

---

upper body (female), while the griffin has a bird's head (eagle): in each case the remainder being supplied by the lion. The sphinx was originally at home in Egypt: where the colossus at Gizeh, though perhaps 'older than Menes,' still excites the astonishment of travellers. A vast number of sphinxes, dating from the time of Amenophis I, formed, and forms, an avenue from the gate of Luxor to the great temple. The Egyptian sphinx is, however, not female (Egyptian *Neb*= the Lord, cp. 2. 175), and not winged. In both these respects the Greek differs morphologically from the Egyptian, and the difference is presumably due to Asiatic influences, at least in part. The sphinx appears on the coinage of Chios, in especial, as symbolical of the cult of Dionysos (cp. Gardner, *Types*, iv. 6, x. 13, B. Head, *Historia*, p. 513). The sphinx of Thebes is a more distinctly mythological creature, but her part in the story of Oedipus may possibly not be older than the Dramatists (Baumeister, p. 1688). The name sphinx is pure Greek (cp. L. & S. *sub voc.*): the Boeotian monster proper, Φίξ (Hesiod, *Theog.* 326) may have been originally quite unlike the later sphinx.

Griffin, γρύψ, is probably like sphinx a good Greek or Indo-German word, the derivation from Hebrew *kerûb* being no longer admitted (A. Furtwängler, in Roscher's *Lexikon*, pp. 1742 ff., from whom what follows is mainly taken). Morphologically the griffin is a composite of lion and eagle (generally the head and wings of eagle on lion's body). Originally it is a distinctly Asiatic monster, not Egyptian: its elements are found in Chaldaea and Assyria, and above all in 'Hittite' art. In Greece it is seen distinctly in the works of Mykenaean art, apparently used for purely decorative purposes. At a later time the figure is associated with Apollo: and it is to be inferred, from later Athenian coins, that the ancient temple figure of Apollo at Delos had two griffins, rampant, one on either side (*op. c.* 1761). In the coinage of Teos, and of its colony Abdera (founded 544 B.C. Hdt. 1. 168), the griffin appears in especial connexion with Dionysos. Cp. Gardner, *Types*, xvi. 9, 10, B. Head, *Historia*, pp. 511, 219. The griffin may signify divine *power*, and may be supposed to *guard* divine places, treasures, etc. Mythologically the monster was poorly treated, and had no such story as the sphinx. Hesiod appears to have introduced the griffins into Greek poetry, and Aristeas (cp. c. 13 *supra*), perhaps working upon some native Scythian legend of gold-guarding monsters (Furtwängler, *op. c.* 1769), located the griffins in the far north (Hdt. 3. 116, 4. 13), and made their function the protection of the gold against the Arimaspi.

> As when a Gryfon through the Wilderness
> Pursues the Arimaspian, who by stelth
> Had from his wakeful custody purloind
> The guarded Gold. *Paradise Lost*, 2. 943 ff.

This is the story rejected by Hdt. Ktesias thought to improve matters by transferring them to India, *Indica* 12, where he describes the animals: *ὄρνεα τετράποδα, μέγεθος ὅσον λύκος· σκέλη καὶ ὄνυχες, οἷάπερ λέων. τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ σώματι πτερά, μέλανα, ἐρυθρὰ δὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ στήθει.* This may be in the main an alternative to the story in Hdt. 3. 102 ff. and is chiefly valuable as showing Ktesias at work. A 'variety' of the griffin also appears on the gold coins of Pantikapaion: "griffin holding spear in jaws treading on ear of corn," Gardner, *Types*, vii. 42; cp. B. Head, *Historia*, p. 239. His index describes this as a "gold-guarding" griffin. The date is c. 350 B.C.

9. **ἐπετέλεσε.** This conduct betrayed an imperfect acquaintance with Hellenic use, according to which such a contretemps would have suspended a ceremony whether secular or religious.

10. **φασι.** This might have been put down as one of the Apothegms of Anacharsis were he himself not open to the same charge. Considering, however, the reputation of the Scyths for *ἀκρητοποσία* and their addiction to hemp-intoxication, this remark reads more like the criticism of a sophistic Greek than a genuine Scythic comment gleaned by Hdt. at first hand in Scythia.

ἐξευρίσκειν. It would have been

ὅστις μαίνεσθαι ἐνάγει ἀνθρώπους. ἐπείτε δὲ ἐτελέσθη τῷ Βακχείῳ ὁ Σκύλης, διεπρήστευσε τῶν τις Βορυσθενεϊτέων πρὸς τοὺς Σκύθας λέγων "ἡμῖν γὰρ καταγελᾶτε, ὦ Σκύθαι, ὅτι βακχεύομεν καὶ ἡμέας ὁ θεὸς λαμβάνει· νῦν οὗτος ὁ δαίμων καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον βασιλέα λελάβηκε, καὶ βακχεύει τε καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαίνεται. εἰ δέ μοι ἀπιστέετε, ἕπεσθε, καὶ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ δέξω." εἵποντο τῶν Σκυθέων οἱ προεστεῶτες, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀναγαγὼν ὁ Βορυσθενεΐτης λάθρῃ ἐπὶ πύργον κατεῖσε. ἐπείτε δὲ παρήιε σὺν τῷ θιάσῳ ὁ Σκύλης καὶ εἶδόν μιν βακχεύοντα οἱ Σκύθαι, κάρτα συμφορὴν μεγάλην ἐποιήσαντο, ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐσήμαινον πάσῃ τῇ στρατιῇ τὰ ἴδοιεν. ὡς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξήλαυνε ὁ Σκύλης 80
ἐς ἤθεα τὰ ἑωυτοῦ, οἱ Σκύθαι προστησάμενοι τὸν ἀδελφεὸν αὐτοῦ Ὀκταμασάδην, γεγονότα ἐκ τῆς Τήρεω θυγατρός, ἐπανιστέατο τῷ Σκύλῃ. ὁ δὲ μαθὼν τὸ γινόμενον ἐπ' ἑωυτῷ καὶ τὴν αἰτίην δι' ἣν ἐποιέετο, καταφεύγει ἐς τὴν Θρηίκην. πυθόμενος δὲ ὁ Ὀκταμασάδης ταῦτα ἐστρατεύετο ἐπὶ τὴν Θρηίκην. ἐπείτε δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἴστρῳ ἐγένετο, ἠντίασάν μιν οἱ Θρήικες, μελλόντων δὲ αὐτῶν συνάψειν ἔπεμψε Σιτάλκης παρὰ τὸν Ὀκταμασάδην λέγων τοιάδε. "τί δεῖ ἡμέας ἀλλήλων πειρηθῆναι; εἷς μέν μευ

---

better according to them to have ignored the existence of such a deity.

12. **διεπρήστευσε.** An ἅπαξ λεγ. (vox nihili, L. & S.), but almost certainly the true reading, the MSS. giving *διεπρήστευε, ἐπρήστευσε, διεπίστευσε*, and Stein's emendation being far the happiest (*Al. διεδρήστευε, διεδρηπέτευσε, διεπέσπευσε, διέδρη ἐντεῦθεν* <*ἐνθεῦτεν* ?>). Stein explains the word as a popular expression ("aus der derben Volkssprache") meaning probably 'taunt,' 'chaff' (höhnen, spotten).

19. **θίασος,** 'procession.'

80. 3. **Τήρεω.** It is a little curious that Teres and Sitalkes should be named here as though they were well-known persons who required no introductions, their names speaking for themselves. When Thucydides (2. 29) has occasion to mention Teres he adds: *ὁ δὲ Τήρης οὗτος ὁ τοῦ Σιτάλκου πατὴρ πρῶτος Ὀδρύσαις τὴν μεγάλην βασιλείαν ἐπὶ πλεῖον τῆς ἄλλης Θρᾴκης ἐποίησε.* Thuc. indeed has so little confidence in his readers that he thinks it necessary to guard against a possible confusion between Teres, father of Sitalkes, and Tereus, husband of Prokne! Blakesley, referring to 7. 137, argues that 7. 137 was written before Sitalkes became notorious; that this notoriety was acquired after Sitalkes joined the Athenian alliance, which he did in the first year of the Peloponnesian war; and that this passage was written after 7. 137. If that were so, this passage would be one of the last additions to the work of Hdt. by the author, though, as Sitalkes cannot be supposed to be dead, it would have been added before 3. 160. But the notoriety of Sitalkes and Teres dated long before the Peloponnesian war: it would be strange if this passage inserted here, referring to events certainly prior to the extradition of Nikolaos and Aneristos, had been obtained and inserted by Hdt. after the passage in Bk. 7, and Blakesley's argument overlooks the possibility of the two stories being from different and independent sources, the terminology of which Hdt. has adopted.

7. **ἐπὶ τῷ Ἴστρῳ.** Inferentially the boundary between Scythia and Thracia.

9. **εἷς μέν μευ τῆς ἀδελφεῆς παῖς.** Sitalkes, son and successor of Teres, was mother's brother (*avunculus*) to Oktamasades, the Thracian mother of Oktamasades being apparently full sister to Sitalkes. In any case his connexion with Skyles was remote, the

τῆς ἀδελφεῆς παῖς, ἔχεις δέ μευ ἀδελφεόν. σὺ δέ μοι ἀπόδος τοῦτον, καὶ ἐγὼ σοὶ τὸν σὸν Σκύλην παραδίδωμι· στρατιῇ δὲ μήτε σὺ κινδυνεύσῃς μήτ᾽ ἐγώ." ταῦτά οἱ πέμψας ὁ Σιτάλκης ἐπεκηρυκεύετο· ἦν γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Ὀκταμασάδῃ ἀδελφεὸς Σιτάλκεω πεφευγώς. ὁ δὲ Ὀκταμασάδης καταινέει ταῦτα, ἐκδοὺς δὲ τὸν ἑωυτοῦ μήτρωα Σιτάλκῃ ἔλαβε τὸν ἀδελφεὸν Σκύλην. καὶ Σιτάλκης μὲν παραλαβὼν τὸν ἀδελφεὸν ἀπήγετο, Σκύλεω δὲ Ὀκταμασάδης αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ ἀπέταμε τὴν κεφαλήν. οὕτω μὲν περιστέλλουσι τὰ σφέτερα νόμαια Σκύθαι, τοῖσι δὲ παρακτωμένοισι ξεινικοὺς νόμους τοιαῦτα ἐπιτίμια διδοῦσι.

81 Πλῆθος δὲ τὸ Σκυθέων οὐκ οἷός τε ἐγενόμην ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι, ἀλλὰ διαφόρους λόγους περὶ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἤκουον· καὶ γὰρ κάρτα πολλοὺς εἶναί σφεας καὶ ὀλίγους ὡς Σκύθας εἶναι. τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ἐς ὄψιν. ἔστι μεταξὺ Βορυσθένεός

---

latter being son of a Greek lady. (Stein oddly makes Sitalkes "mütterlicher Oheim Beider, des Skyles und des Oktamasades.") He died in 424 B.C. Thuc. 4. 101.

10. **ἀδελφεόν.** Possibly as Stein suggests Sparadokos, Thuc. 2. 101, whose son Seuthes succeeded, 4. 101.

18. **οὕτω.** Hdt. we may suspect draws hardly the full and correct moral of this story. Oktamasades is a near relative to Sitalkes. The two relatives are each holding a throne, the one as pretender, the other against a pretender, both anyway against possible rivals: and each by an exchange of prisoners has it in his power to secure his own possession. In the dethronement of Skyles there is much apparently of dynastic intrigue and personal quarrel, though prejudice may have been raised against him as 'Hellenic.' Even this feeling may have had as much policy as religion in it. Cp. Introduction, § 22.

81. 1. **ἐγενόμην**, *i.e.* when I was making my inquiries;—when, where, and from whom he made inquiry, Hdt. unfortunately does not say. Such omissions are to be ascribed not to a wish on the historian's part to exaggerate his own authority, but rather to a certain laxity in his canons of evidence: cp. Introduction, § 20.

3. **ὡς Σκύθας εἶναι**, 'genuine Scyths,' 'Scyths properly so called.' In 2. 8 *οὐκέτι πολλὸν χωρίον ὥς εἶναι Αἰγύπτου* is exactly parallel, cp. 2. 135 where ἂν is added. As to the matter Thuc. 1. 97 commits himself to the former view: and oddly enough Hdt. commits himself similarly in regard to the Thracians, 5. 3 *infra*. See note there: and in regard to the Indi 3. 94. A reconciliation of the two statements here is not difficult, if the population of the territory, more or less subject to the Scyths, be distinguished from the Scyths proper, or nomad Scyths, or even royal Scyths, who were not perhaps 'the most numerous' but the only genuine Scyths. Cp. cc. 19, 20 *supra*, and Appendix I.

4. **τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ἐς ὄψιν.** A good deal depends on the exact meaning of this sentence. It has generally been taken to prove that Hdt. visited this spot Exampaios, and had seen the bronze krater described below. But grammatically the words fully admit of another interpretation. Hdt. uses the imperfect of actions which were projected but not performed or accomplished: so *e.g.* *ἐμισθοῦτο παρ᾽ οὐκ ἐκδιδόντος τὴν αὐλήν* 1. 68; *πέμψαντες . . ἐς Σάρδις χρυσὸν ὠνέοντο* 1. 69; *ἐπεθύμησε τῆς χλανίδος καὶ αὐτὴν προσελθὼν ὠνέετο* 3. 139; *οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἐξεῖργόν μιν* 5. 22; *ἀνέπειθε πάντας Κυπρίους συναπίστασθαι* 5. 104. Add *φαίνουσι* in c. 82 *infra*, which certainly does not mean "they succeeded in showing me." It is obvious, then, that in this passage Hdt. does not clearly say that he saw the krater at Exampaios. He only says: 'They were for showing'—'offered to show me.' The point of his assertion is not his autopsy, but their

τε ποταμοῦ καὶ Ὑπάνιος χῶρος, οὔνομα δέ οἵ ἐστι Ἐξαμπαῖος· τοῦ καὶ ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον τούτων μνήμην εἶχον, φάμενος ἐν αὐτῷ κρήνην ὕδατος πικροῦ εἶναι, ἀπ' ἧς τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπορρέον τὸν Ὕπανιν ἄποτον ποιέειν. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χώρῳ κέεται χαλκήιον, μεγάθεϊ καὶ ἑξαπλήσιον τοῦ ἐπὶ στόματι τοῦ Πόντου κρητῆρος, τὸν Πανσανίης ὁ Κλεομβρότου ἀνέθηκε. ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω

---

argument, and the form of his expression is also remarkable. (He does not put it as elsewhere *αὐτὸς ἐς ὄψιν ἀπικόμενος aut sim.* cp. c. 195 *infra*, Introduction, § 20.) His expression discredits their argument, not the existence of the krater of Exampaios: Hdt., while accepting what he heard of the existence of this vast krater, apparently does not think much of it as an optical demonstration of the number of the Scyths, nor commit himself to the story of its origin. But he does not doubt its existence *in situ* at the moment of writing (*κέεται*) nor assert that it was there when he visited the place (*ἐκεῖτο*). Stein explains the subject of *ἀπέφαινον* as *οἱ ἐπιχώριοι* from l. 13 *infra*, but supplies *οἱ Τυρῖται* as the subject of *φαίνουσι*, c. 82. This is inconsequent. If *Τυρῖται* be the subject of *φαίνουσι* it may just as well be the subject of *ἀπέφαινον*, or *ἀπέφαινον* may have a different subject from *ἔλεγον* and from *φαίνουσι*. Even if *οἱ ἐπιχώριοι*, or *ἐπιχώριοι*, be supplied as subject to *ἀπέφαινον* it would not be necessary to conclude that Hdt. visited Exampaios, or saw the krater.

If it be argued that the natural way of understanding this passage is the way in which it has been generally understood, I admit so much. But the question is whether the view here advanced is not tenable as a grammatical and logical exposition of the passage, and materially coherent with the general evidences in regard to Hdt.'s visit to the Pontos. If the passage implies a visit to Exampaios, which yet is not directly asserted, it raises the question of Hdt.'s honesty and character as a historian: but if it is conceivable that he might have penned this passage without having been to Exampaios, and without wishing it to be supposed that he had been to Exampaios, *cadit quaestio*. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

6. **τοῦ . . εἶχον**, *i.e.* in c. 52 *supra*: compare with this the use of the same phrase in c. 79 of a statement made five lines higher, and it is difficult to believe that the four passages were originally in the relation in which we now find them to one another: the first *τοῦ καὶ ὀλίγον κτλ.* referring to a statement five lines up; the second referring back over this statement to a statement upwards of 400 (404) lines before (reckoned in Stein's ed. 1884). The story of Skyles, cc. 78-80, may have been inserted after the original composition of the passages 52, 81. But the mystery of the original order of composition is well-nigh insoluble. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

8. **χαλκήιον**, a bronze. Cp. c. 152 *infra*. 1. 68 it is used in a different sense ('a smithy'). This Scythian krater is six times the size of one at the Bosporos (which held therefore only about 100 amphoreis). Assuming the *ἀμφορεὺς* here to be the same measure as the Attic *μετρητής* (see Hultsch, *Metrologie*^{2}, p. 101) which was = 39·39 litres, or about 9 gallons, 600 would = 239·37 hektolitres, or upwards of 5000 gallons. It has been calculated that this krater would have weighed upwards of 40,000 (41,000) old French pounds, and that no modern cast could be compared to it except the great bell in the Kremlin at Moscow, *vid.* Baehr. On the Bosporos, in the third century B.C., this krater was still to be seen: the story then ran that it was older than the time of Pausanias, and that he had appropriated and rededicated it in his own name. So Nymphis of Herakleia *apud* Athenaeum, p. 536 (7. 9). Cp. the story of Pausanias and a similar act at Delphi, Thuc. 1. 132 (which might be regarded as a confirmation or as a source of the story in Athenaeus); or the conduct of the Lacedaemonians in the case of the golden *περιρραντήριον* 1. 51. Such plagiarisms were common with the Pharaohs. Cp. Wiedemann, *Aegypt. Gesch.* i. 87.

It is curious that Hdt. should not refer to the silver krater, dedicated by Kroisos at Delphi, 1. 51, which so many of his readers or hearers would have seen, and which was as nearly as possible the same size as the Scythian bronze.

10. **ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδε.** Cp. formula, cc. 74

τοῦτον, ὧδε δηλώσω· ἑξακοσίους ἀμφορέας εὐπετέως χωρέει τὸ ἐν Σκύθῃσι χαλκήιον, πάχος δὲ τὸ Σκυθικὸν τοῦτο χαλκήιόν ἐστι δακτύλων ἕξ. τοῦτο ὦν ἔλεγον οἱ ἐπιχώριοι ἀπὸ ἀρδίων γενέσθαι. βουλόμενον γὰρ τὸν σφέτερον βασιλέα, τῷ οὔνομα εἶναι Ἀριάνταν, τοῦτον εἰδέναι τὸ πλῆθος τὸ Σκυθέων κελεύειν μιν πάντας Σκύθας ἄρδιν ἕκαστον μίαν [ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀιστοῦ] κομίσαι· ὃς δ' ἂν μὴ κομίσῃ, θάνατον ἀπείλεε. κομισθῆναί τε δὴ χρῆμα πολλὸν ἀρδίων καί οἱ δόξαι ἐξ αὐτέων μνημόσυνον ποιήσαντι λιπέσθαι. ἐκ τουτέων δή μιν τὸ χαλκήιον ποιῆσαι τοῦτο καὶ ἀναθεῖναι ἐς τὸν Ἐξαμπαῖον τοῦτον. ταῦτα δὲ περὶ τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ Σκυθέων ἤκουον.

82 *Θωμάσια δὲ ἡ χώρη αὕτη οὐκ ἔχει, χωρὶς ἢ ὅτι ποταμούς τε πολλῷ μεγίστους καὶ ἀριθμὸν πλείστους. τὸ δὲ ἀποθωμάσαι ἄξιον καὶ πάρεξ τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ τοῦ μεγάθεος τοῦ πεδίου παρέχεται, εἰρήσεται· ἴχνος Ἡρακλέος φαίνουσι ἐν πέτρῃ ἐνεόν, τὸ ἔοικε μὲν βήματι ἀνδρός, ἔστι δὲ τὸ μέγαθος δίπηχυ, παρὰ τὸν Τύρην ποταμόν. τοῦτο μέν νυν τοιοῦτό ἐστι, ἀναβήσομαι δὲ ἐς τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς ἤια λέξων λόγον.*

83 *Παρασκευαζομένου Δαρείου ἐπὶ τοὺς Σκύθας καὶ ἐπιπέμ-*

---

supra, 99 *infra* (ὃς δὲ . . μὴ παραπέπλωκε). The implication is strongly in favour of Hdt.'s having seen the krater of Pausanias. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

15. **Ἀριάνταν.** Gutschmid (*Encl. B.* xxi.[9] 578 n.[1]) dates the *floruit* of this king to the time of the Scythian embassy to Sparta, 6. 84 *infra: obscurum per obscurius.* As bronze arrow-heads are found in Scythian tombs, the story of the 'primitive census' has verisimilitude. The number of arrow-heads to a pound (old French) × 41,000 would give the number of the Scythians, though only presumably adult males (archers).

17. **χρῆμα.** 1. 36, 3. 109, 130.

20. **ταῦτα** may cover all back to *τοσόνδε μέντοι*, or even to *καὶ γὰρ κάρτα.* In either case the *ἤκουον* militates against the inference that Hdt. had been to Exampaios or seen the krater of Ariantas.

82. 1. **ἡ χώρη αὕτη** must obviously be used in the widest sense to include all Scythia at least; but Hdt.'s negation carries no inference as to his travels in the land. The size of the plain has nowhere been insisted on: were it not hinted in c. 23, one might suspect *καὶ τοῦ μεγάθεος τ. πεδίου* for an insertion. On the plain *vid.* quotations in Rawlinson, iii. p. 41 n. 8, and note to *l.c.*

The rivers and the plain were certainly two broad features which might well astonish a Greek accustomed to the streams of Hellas proper, or even of Ionia, and their mountain-valleys. The *ἴχνος Ἡρ.* seems rather a bathos thereafter. Hdt. by no means says he has seen this wonder, and Stein is divided between *οἱ ἐπιχώριοι* and *οἱ Τυρῖται* as subject for *φαίνουσι.* As Herakles was not a Scythian divinity, and as his mark in the rock would have the same moral as the Herakleid legend above cc. 8-10, viz. to establish a claim for the Greeks, we may be pretty sure that it was Greeks, of Tyras or elsewhere, who acted as showmen in this case, though the presence of Herakles may signify a Phoenician trade-route. Cp. cc. 8, 59 *supra.*

5. **δίπηχυ.** Same size as the shoe of Perseus in Egypt 2. 91. *Ex pede Herculem:* it follows that the one hero was about the same superhuman size as the other. A foot of two cubits would give a height of about twelve cubits: or upwards of 18 feet.

7. **λόγον.** The story of the Scythian expedition, resumed from c. 1 or 4, rather than the (geographical) *λόγος* introduced c. 16. For the phrase cp. 5. 62 *infra*, and Introduction, p. lxxv.

83. 1. **παρασκευαζομένου.** Cp. c. 4

πομπος ἀγγέλους ἐπιτάξοντας τοῖσι μὲν πεζὸν στρατόν, τοῖσι
δὲ νέας παρέχειν, τοῖσι δὲ ζεύγνυσθαι τὸν Θρηίκιον Βόσπορον,
Ἀρτάβανος ὁ Ὑστάσπεος, ἀδελφεὸς ἐὼν Δαρείου, ἐχρήιζε
μηδαμῶς αὐτὸν στρατηίην ἐπὶ Σκύθας ποιέεσθαι, καταλέγων τῶν
Σκυθέων τὴν ἀπορίην. ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἔπειθε συμβουλεύων οἱ
χρηστά, ὁ μὲν ἐπέπαυτο, ὁ δέ, ἐπειδή οἱ τὰ ἅπαντα παρε-
σκεύαστο, ἐξήλαυνε τὸν στρατὸν ἐκ Σούσων. ἐνθαῦτα τῶν 84
Περσέων Οἰόβαζος ἐδεήθη Δαρείου τριῶν ἐόντων οἱ παίδων καὶ
πάντων στρατευομένων ἕνα αὐτῷ καταλειφθῆναι. ὁ δὲ ἔφη ὡς
φίλῳ ἐόντι καὶ μετρίων δεομένῳ πάντας τοὺς παῖδας καταλείψειν.
ὁ μὲν δὴ Οἰόβαζος περιχαρὴς ἦν, ἐλπίζων τοὺς υἱέας στρατηίης
ἀπολελύσθαι· ὁ δὲ ἐκέλευσε τοὺς ἐπὶ τούτων ἐπεστεῶτας
ἀποκτεῖναι πάντας τοὺς Οἰοβάζου παῖδας. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν

---

supra, and on the story of the Scythic expedition see Appendix III.

ἐπιπέμποντος, 'sending on.'

2. **τοῖσι δὲ νέας.** Apparently Ionians or Hellenes only: but see c. 87 *infra*. Phoenician vessels do not appear in the Aegean until the Ionian Revolt. Cp. (5. 108) 6. 6 *infra*. But their absence on the present occasion is curious.

3. **τοῖσι δὲ ζεύγνυσθαι.** Probably Hellenes, as appears cc. 87, 88 *infra*, though Phoenician engineers were afterwards employed, in conjunction with Greeks, by Xerxes on the canal at Athos 7. 23, and Phoenicians and Egyptians on the bridges over Hellespont 7. 34. The Bosporos (wrongly Bosphoros) still bears the name *Θρηίκιον*, to distinguish it from the Kimmerian Bosporos (straits of Yenikale): cp. cc. 12, 28 *supra*, 100 *infra*.

4. **Ἀρτάβανος** has already an old head on comparatively young shoulders. Thirty years afterwards he reappears to damp the military ambition of Xerxes, 7. 10, where he is represented as referring to the advice he is here reported to have given to Dareios. Cp. also c. 143 *infra*. Such advice comes better from the uncle to the nephew, than from the younger to the elder brother.

5. **αὐτόν**, 'in person.' Cp. c. 1 *supra*.

καταλέγων. Used here in a somewhat remarkable way, as only one single particular is specified: perhaps Hdt. had already robbed Artabanos of his items in the passages quoted below. In *ἡ καταλεχθεῖσα πᾶσα χώρη* c. 28 *supra* the account embraces many particulars, as still more obviously in cc. 50, 95, 114, 118. Cp. specially 5. 36, 6. 53.

6. **τὴν ἀπορίην.** In 7. 10 Artabanos explains this: *ἄνδρας οὐδαμόθι γῆς ἄστυ νέμοντας.* Cp. c. 46 *supra* *τοῖσι γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα . . ἄμαχοί τε καὶ ἄποροι προσμισγεῖν.* Cp. also the remarks of Gobryas c. 134 *infra*. (From another point of view the Scythians were remarkable for a certain *εὐπορία*, c. 59 *supra*.)

8. **Σούσων.** The capital of Elam had been adopted or retained as one of the royal residences by Dareios, if not by Kyros. Cp. note to 5. 49 *infra*. We hear little in the Greek authors before the age of Alexander of Persian capitals proper. It does not seem probable that the *στρατός* started from Susa: a rendezvous would have been appointed: cp. 6. 95, 7. 26.

84. 2. **Οἰόβαζος ἐδεήθη Δαρείου.** Xerxes on a similar provocation at *Sardes* (see the anecdote of Pythios, 7. 38, 39) is content to execute one out of a family of five sons: but then he gives Pythios 'a bit of his mind'; which is perhaps necessary, in order that proper emphasis should be laid upon the conduct of Xerxes, who was bound to leave nothing undone in the despot's rôle. Other circumstances in the anecdote of Xerxes may be taken to subserve the same unconscious purpose. But the action of Dareios is the more savage, though not on that account the more probable. It is even possible that it is a *replica* of the anecdote of Xerxes. (Cp. Introduction, pp. lxv. ff.)

6. **τοὺς ἐπὶ τούτων ἐπεστεῶτας.** Cp. 7. 39 *τοῖσι προσετέτακτο ταῦτα πρήσσειν*: 7. 36 *τοῖσι προσέκειτο αὕτη ἡ ἄχαρις τιμή.*

85 ἀποσφαγέντες αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ ἐλείποντο· Δαρεῖος δὲ ἐπείτε πορευόμενος ἐκ Σούσων ἀπίκετο τῆς Καλχηδονίης ἐπὶ τὸν Βόσπορον ἵνα ἔζευκτο ἡ γέφυρα, ἐνθεῦτεν ἐσβὰς ἐς νέα ἔπλεε ἐπὶ τὰς Κυανέας καλευμένας, τὰς πρότερον πλαγκτὰς Ἕλληνές φασι εἶναι, ἑζόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ ῥίῳ ἐθηεῖτο τὸν Πόντον ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητον. πελαγέων γὰρ ἁπάντων πέφυκε θωμασιώτατος· τοῦ τὸ μὲν μῆκος στάδιοί εἰσι ἑκατὸν καὶ χίλιοι καὶ μύριοι, τὸ δὲ εὖρος, τῇ εὐρύτατος αὐτὸς ἑωυτοῦ, στάδιοι τριηκόσιοι καὶ τρισχίλιοι. τούτου τοῦ πελάγεος τὸ στόμα ἐστὶ εὖρος τέσσερες στάδιοι· μῆκος δὲ τοῦ στόματος, ὁ αὐχήν, τὸ δὴ Βόσπορος κέκληται, κατ' ὃ δὴ ἔζευκτο ἡ γέφυρα, ἐπὶ σταδίους εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατόν ἐστι. τείνει δ' ἐς τὴν Προποντίδα ὁ Βόσπορος· ἡ δὲ Προποντὶς ἐοῦσα εὖρος μὲν σταδίων πεντακοσίων, μῆκος δὲ τετρακοσίων καὶ

---

8. **αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ.** In Susa.

85. 2. **Καλχηδονίης.** Cp. c. 144 *infra.* The journey from Susa to the Bosporos is lightly regarded here: did not the king winter on the way, as Xerxes at Sardes in 481-0 B.C.? Cp. Introduction, p. xxxv. n.

3. **νέα.** Presumably a Greek ship; but whose?

4. **Κυανέας.** *πλαγκτὰς δή τοι τάς γε θεοὶ μάκαρες καλέουσιν Od.* 12. 61, *alias* *Συμπληγάδες*, Eurip. *Medeia* 2. Hdt. appears to doubt their former mobility.

5. **ἐπὶ ῥίῳ.** An emendation for *ἱρῷ* or *τῷ ἱρῷ*. No temple has been mentioned. Some would emend *ἱρῷ* into *ἰκρίῳ* the deck or poop of the ship. But *ἴκρια* (*τὰ*) is the only form recognised: the singular here would be unique (cp. 5. 16 *infra*) and the remark in any case feeble. The temple of Zeus Urios must be meant, if the reading *τῷ ἱρῷ* be retained.

6. **ἁπάντων.** Hdt. evidently does not think of the Mediterranean as one *πέλαγος* but as made up of several *πελάγη*. Cp. the last words of the chapter. The Pontos is made more than twice too long in this estimate, the straight line from the Bosporos to the Phasis being only about 630 miles (5500 stades) instead of 1280 miles (11,100 st.). It may be said of course that Hdt. is following the coast line, and bases his estimate on the time occupied by sailing, cp. c. 86. In that case he must have vastly overrated the way made under sail, as the distance "even following the sinuosities of the coast" does not exceed 7000 stades (800 m.). These figures are taken from Rawlinson, who asserts that Hdt. "had probably been himself from the Bosphorus (*sic*) to the Phasis in a sailing ship." If that were so, how did Hdt. come to take the Phasis as the eastern boundary of the north coast of Asia minor, and apparently to think of that coast as much straighter than it is? Cp. c. 38 *supra.*

7. **τὸ δὲ εὖρος** instead of being 3300 stades (380 miles) is about 2340 stades (270 miles).

9. **τὸ στόμα** is now rather more than six, but the passage may have been widened by the current.

10. **ὁ αὐχήν** looks like a gloss specially with *τὸ* following, and might have been supplied from c. 118 *infra.* Stein suggests that the Pontos was regarded as the trunk and the Propontis as the head, and so the Bosporos becomes the neck: but the parallel of the Danube disposes of such exact analogy, c. 89 *infra.* The 120 stades, an understatement; the length being about 16 miles (140 st.).

12. **Προποντίδα.** As a rule Hdt. does not distinguish the Propontis from the Hellespont, *vide* c. 38 *supra.* So, for example, he calls the inhabitants of Perinthos Hellespontians 5. 1 *infra.* This passage may have been written with fuller knowledge of the character of the waterway between the Aegean and Euxine, gained by his own voyage.

13. **εὖρος . . μῆκος.** R. corrects the breadth to 440 st. (*c.* 50 m.) taking the line from Perinthos to Plakia; and the length to 1000 st. or 115 m.

The length of the Hellespont is "as nearly as possible 40 miles (about 345 stades)": its breadth is now about one mile ($8\frac{2}{3}$ stades).

χιλίων, καταδιδοῖ ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἐόντα στεινότητα μὲν ἑπτὰ σταδίους, μῆκος δὲ τετρακοσίους. ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος ἐς χάσμα πελάγεος τὸ δὴ Αἰγαῖον καλέεται.

86 *μεμέτρηται δὲ ταῦτα ὧδε. νηῦς ἐπίπαν μάλιστά κῃ κατανύει ἐν μακρημερίῃ ὀργυιὰς ἑπτακισμυρίας, νυκτὸς δὲ ἑξακισμυρίας. ἤδη ὦν ἐς μὲν Φᾶσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τοῦ Πόντου μακρότατον) ἡμερέων ἐννέα πλόος ἐστὶ καὶ νυκτῶν ὀκτώ· αὗται ἕνδεκα μυριάδες καὶ ἑκατὸν ὀργυιέων γίνονται, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὀργυιέων τουτέων στάδιοι ἑκατὸν καὶ χίλιοι καὶ μύριοί εἰσι. ἐς δὲ Θεμισκύρην τὴν ἐπὶ Θερμώδοντι ποταμῷ ἐκ τῆς Σινδικῆς (κατὰ τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τοῦ Πόντου εὐρύτατον) τριῶν τε ἡμερέων καὶ δύο νυκτῶν πλόος· αὗται δὲ τρεῖς μυριάδες καὶ τριήκοντα ὀργυιέων γίνονται, στάδιοι δὲ τριηκόσιοι καὶ τρισχίλιοι. ὁ μέν νυν Πόντος οὗτος καὶ Βόσπορός τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντος οὕτω τέ μοι μεμετρέαται καὶ κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα πεφύκασι, παρέχεται δὲ καὶ λίμνην ὁ Πόντος οὗτος ἐκδιδοῦσαν ἐς αὐτὸν οὐ πολλῷ τέῳ ἐλάσσω ἑωυτοῦ, ἣ Μαιῆτίς τε καλέεται καὶ μήτηρ τοῦ Πόντου.*

---

14. **καταδιδοῖ ἐς**, 'opens down into . . .'

15. The accusative **σταδίους** is curious. Krüger proposed *ἐπ' ἑπτὰ σ.*, Stein the genitive.

86. 1. **μεμέτρηται.** Cp. *infra*, *μοι μεμετρέαται.* The expression does not in any way carry with it the inference that Hdt. had performed the voyage; it only asserts that he has made a calculation, based on certain data which he indicates. He is probably correct in estimating the voyage from the Bosporos to the Phasis as nine days and eight nights (not allowing for obstruction or delay) and the passage from the Thermodon to Sindike at three days and two nights: he goes astray in taking the distance performed by a sailing ship in twenty-four hours as equal to 13,000 fathoms, or 1300 stades (2. 149), nearly 150 miles. Generally 1000 stades (115 miles) seems to have been reckoned as a twenty-four hours voyage. Cp. Smith, *Dict. Antiq.*^{2} p. 755.

2. For **μακρημερίῃ** there is good MSS. authority.

4. **μακρότατον.** An error; the greatest length being from bay of Burghaz (Apollonia) to the Phasis, about 700 miles (over 6000 stades).

8. **Σινδικῆς** is an obvious emendation by Wesseling for *ἰνδικῆς*. Cp. c. 28 *supra*.

12. Van H. brackets the first **οὗτος** and drops the second. The apparatus of the editors here leaves something to be desired, but the passages cited by van H. and quoted by Stein *ed. maj.* from Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* i. 287, *Etym. M.* p. 578, 43 suggest some doubt as to the ultimate source of this chapter.

13. **παρέχεται . . Πόντου.** Stein thinks this last sentence is a later addition: what, only the last sentence? Perhaps the whole passage from *τρισχίλιοι supra* or from *ἑκατόν ἐστι*, in c. 85.

15. **Μαιῆτις.** At present the Sea of Azof is not much more than one-twelfth the size of the Black Sea. It is reasonable on such a matter to suppose that Hdt. made a mistake rather than enlarge the Palus Maeotis in the time of Hdt. to "an area four or five times as great as it has at present" (Rawlinson), an enlargement which would still leave the Palus much too small for the position. How should Hdt. have had accurate knowledge of its size? The name has been derived from the tribe of Moeetae or Maeetae, whom Rawlinson would connect with the Sauro-Mătae. Maeotae a quibus lacus nomen accepit, Plin. 4. 26, 10. Inscriptions of the Bosporane kingdom give the form of the name as *Μαῖται*, cp. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, Nos. 103, 104 (*C.I.G.* 2118, 2119). The folk is mentioned c. 123 *infra*.

μήτηρ. Strabo 214 *ad fin.* quotes Polybios as saying that the Timavus was

87 Ὁ δὲ Δαρεῖος ὡς ἐθεήσατο τὸν Πόντον, ἔπλεε ὀπίσω ἐπὶ τὴν γέφυραν, τῆς ἀρχιτέκτων ἐγένετο Μανδροκλέης Σάμιος· θεησάμενος δὲ καὶ τὸν Βόσπορον στήλας ἔστησε δύο ἐπ' αὐτοῦ λίθου λευκοῦ, ἐνταμὼν γράμματα ἐς μὲν τὴν Ἀσσύρια ἐς δὲ τὴν Ἑλληνικά, ἔθνεα πάντα ὅσα περ ἦγε· ἦγε δὲ πάντα τῶν ἦρχε. τούτων μυριάδες ἐξηριθμήθησαν, χωρὶς τοῦ ναυτικοῦ, ἑβδομήκοντα σὺν ἱππεῦσι, νέες δὲ ἑξακόσιαι συνελέχθησαν. τῇσι μέν νυν στήλῃσι ταύτῃσι Βυζάντιοι κομίσαντες ἐς τὴν πόλιν ὕστερον τούτων ἐχρήσαντο πρὸς τὸν βωμὸν τῆς Ὀρθωσίης Ἀρτέμιδος,

---

locally called *πηγὴν καὶ μητέρα τῆς θαλάσσης* (Adriatic). The 'large' lake from which the Hypanis was said to rise is called c. 52 *supra* *μήτηρ Ὑπάνιος*. In the case of the P. Maeotis a popular Greek etymology (*μαῖα*) may have suggested, or enforced the metaphor.

87. 1. **ὡς ἐθεήσατο**, 'when he was done beholding . . .'

3. **στήλας.** Perhaps one (in cuneiform) on the Asiatic and the other on the European side? Or were both on the European side, as we might infer from the action of the Byzantines described just below? One might have expected bilingual inscriptions, *i.e.* both languages on the same stone. In any case such inscriptions would furnish information to Hdt., or to his sources (cp. 5. 36, and Introduction, p. lxxxiii).

4. **λίθου λευκοῦ.** Marble, c. 79 *supra*. **Ἀσσύρια,** *i.e.* cuneiform, Persian. "Hdt. is no doubt inaccurate when he speaks here of *Assyrian* letters" R. How, when, and where was the numbering effected? Obviously before these inscriptions were cut. The record in c. 92 *infra* looks like a rude attempt at enumeration. The passage before us here is perhaps part of an addition made after Hdt. had visited the Pontos.

5. **ἦγε δὲ πάντα κτλ.** Like Xerxes. This generality should imply that Phoenicians, Egyptians, Cyprians were serving: how if not on the fleet? But in any case the phrase is a patent exaggeration. 700,000 including the cavalry is given as the number realised by the general *Levée* of the Persian empire at this time. This is a mere trifle compared to the *levée en masse* effected by Xerxes Bk. 7. The number of ships is here 600. In the Marathonian campaign there are also 600 ships, triremes, 6. 95 *infra*. Cp. note *ad l.c.* No nation or people is named in this story as contributing ships to the fleet except the Greeks (Ionians, Aeolians, Hellespontines). The Ionian fleet at Lade some eighteen years afterwards numbered only 353. See 6. 8 *infra*. It is very improbable that the 600 vessels employed on the Scythic campaign can have been supplied exclusively by Greeks. Cp. c. 89 *infra*. Phoenician and perhaps Egyptian vessels were included, cp. 3. 19 for Phoenician fleet under Kambyses, 7. 89, 8. 90 under Xerxes, Aegyptians 7. 89, 8. 17. But the sources used by Hdt. ignored all but the Greek vessels, for the Scythian expedition.

8. **ὕστερον.** How long after? Hdt. apparently does not know, or he would, we may suppose, have been more exact (cp. 6. 118): nor is he apparently aware of the tradition that a similar act of defiance was perpetrated by the Kalchedonians on the Asiatic side. Ktesias § 17 (ed. Gilmore, p. 151). Stein suggests on the strength of this passage that the date was immediately after the failure of the expedition. (But was it a failure?) Cp. however c. 143 *infra*: and Appendix III.

9. **τῆς Ὀρθωσίης Ἀρτ.** Stein, n. *ad l.*, connects the worship of Artemis Orthosia at Byzantion with the Dorian colonisation from the metropolis Megara, and appears to regard this deity as popular with *Dorians*. Schreiber, in Roscher's *Lexikon* 585, contents himself with describing Artemis Orthia as of purely *Hellenic* origin ("eine . . . ihrem Ursprunge nach rein hellenische Gestalt"). The identification of Artemis Orthia with Iphigeneia (cp. c. 103 *infra*) and her connexion with Orestes and Agamemnon disprove a specifically Dorian character, though no doubt the cult was found and adopted, with more or less of modification, in Sparta and Megara, and other places where the

χωρὶς ἑνὸς λίθου· οὗτος δὲ κατελείφθη παρὰ τοῦ Διονύσου τὸν νηὸν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ, γραμμάτων Ἀσσυρίων πλέος. τοῦ δὲ Βοσπόρου ὁ χῶρος τὸν ἔζευξε βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει συμβαλλομένῳ, μέσον ἐστὶ Βυζαντίου τε καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ στόματι ἱροῦ.

Δαρεῖος δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἡσθεὶς τῇ σχεδίῃ τὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα 88 αὐτῆς Μανδροκλέα τὸν Σάμιον ἐδωρήσατο πᾶσι δέκα· ἀπ' ὧν δὴ Μανδροκλέης ἀπαρχὴν ζῷα γραψάμενος πᾶσαν τὴν ζεῦξιν τοῦ Βοσπόρου καὶ βασιλέα τε Δαρεῖον ἐν προεδρίῃ κατήμενον καὶ τὸν στρατὸν αὐτοῦ διαβαίνοντα, ταῦτα γραψάμενος ἀνέθηκε ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον, ἐπιγράψας τάδε.

Dorians pushed in. The primitive localisation of the cult at Lemnos (old name of Lemnos, Taurike, Schreiber, *op. c.* 586) may be safely taken back to a prae-Hellenic epoch. The idea that Byzantion was genuinely Dorian because Megara was its metropolis is on a par with the theory that Kyrene was Dorian because Thera was its metropolis, *vide infra* cc. 147 ff.

If the Phoenicians penetrated into the Pontos before the Greeks, it is probable that they carried their cults of 'Artemis' and 'Herakles' with them (cp. notes c. 82 *supra*). When colonists from Hellas arrived, they found cults already established, which they rightly identified with cults they had left behind, the religions in Peloponnese, in the islands, on Hellespont and Bosporos comprising elements that were there established long prior to the advent of the Dorians, and foreign, if not anterior, to the Hellenic settlement.

Orthosia: the cult was ascetic and sensual. Schreiber, *op. c.* 586, suggests a phallic origin for the title, comparing Dionysos Orthos, the ὀρθία ὕβρις of the Ass, Pindar *Pyth.* 10, 32, and Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 944 (cp. ὀρθὰ 2. 51). We may add that the ὀνοφορβὸς Astrabakos was said to have found the lost image of Artemis Orthia, and to have gone out of his mind thereon. Pausan. 3. 16. See for Astrabakos 6. 69 *infra*. Yet the hypothesis looks awkward in regard to a female title, though it may be preferred to Preller's suggestion (*Gr. Myth.* i.[3] 250) that the title was derived from the stiff columnar character of the archaic images of the goddess, a characteristic which was not confined to the ξόανα in question.

Rawlinson understands 'A. ὀ. to be "Diana (*sic*) who had established or *preserved* their city. (Compare the Latin '*Jupiter Stator*.')" As a matter of fact Dionys. Halic. uses Ὀρθώσιος Ζεὺς for the Latin *Jupiter Stator*, 2. 50. Jup. Stator however is not the founder, establisher, or preserver of cities, but a god of battle. Livy 1. 198. Cp. Preller, *Rom. Myth.* vol. i. p. 351, and vol. ii. p. 198 (where *Stator item Conservator* and *item depulsor* are given from *C.I.L.*).

May we not venture to regard A. Orthosia as a later and more ethical form of A. Orthia? The first place where the title occurs is in Pindar, *Ol.* 3. 30, B.C. 476. The derivation of the title from a mountain in Arcadia named Orthion (Schol. to Pindar) is worthy of a Scholiast, and is refuted by the alternative: ἤτοι τῇ ὀρθούσῃ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐκ τῶν τοκετῶν ἀγούσῃ, an alternative which has at least the merit of a reference to recognised functions of Artemis.

12. **ὁ χῶρος**. The description reads very like autopsy, cp. Introduction, § 21.

14. **ἱροῦ**. Cp. c. 85 *supra*.

88. 1. **ἡσθείς**. Dareios' progress through Thrace is a succession of delights: the Despot was in excellent humour: see further c. 91 *infra*, ἡσθεὶς τῷ ποταμῷ, and c. 97 κάρτα δὲ ἥσθη τῇ γνώμῃ.

2. **πᾶσι δέκα**. Stein compares 9. 81, and warns against taking the words literally (as R. does).

5. **γραψάμενος**. Can any one doubt that Hdt. saw this picture in the Heraion, or that stories connected with it have found their way into his narrative? How much of the story of the campaign may be due to Samian sources it is impossible

Βόσπορον ἰχθυόεντα γεφυρώσας ἀνέθηκε
Μανδροκλέης Ἥρῃ μνημόσυνον σχεδίης,
αὐτῷ μὲν στέφανον περιθείς, Σαμίοισι δὲ κῦδος,
Δαρείου βασιλέος ἐκτελέσας κατὰ νοῦν.

89 ταῦτα μέν νυν τοῦ ζεύξαντος τὴν γέφυραν μνημόσυνα ἐγένετο· Δαρεῖος δὲ δωρησάμενος Μανδροκλέα διέβαινε ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην, τοῖσι Ἴωσι παραγγείλας πλέειν ἐς τὸν Πόντον μέχρι Ἴστρου ποταμοῦ, ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀπίκωνται ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον, ἐνθαῦτα αὐτὸν περιμένειν ζευγνύντας τὸν ποταμόν. τὸ γὰρ δὴ ναυτικὸν ἦγον Ἴωνές τε καὶ Αἰολέες καὶ Ἑλλησπόντιοι. ὁ μὲν δὴ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς Κυανέας διεκπλώσας ἔπλεε ἰθὺ τοῦ Ἴστρου, ἀναπλώσας δὲ ἀνὰ ποταμὸν δυῶν ἡμερέων πλόον ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸν αὐχένα, ἐκ τοῦ σχίζεται τὰ στόματα τοῦ Ἴστρου, ἐζεύγνυε. Δαρεῖος δὲ ὡς διέβη τὸν Βόσπορον κατὰ τὴν σχεδίην, ἐπορεύετο διὰ τῆς Θρηίκης, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ Τεάρου ποταμοῦ

---

to determine exactly: but this picture has to be reckoned with. Samos had passed first of the islands into the Persian empire, 3. 139. On its engineers cp. 3. 60. The greatest work at Samos, the water tunnel and duct, so accurately described by Hdt. *l.c.* (cp. H. F. Tozer, *Islands of the Aegean*, pp. 168 ff.), was the work of a Megarian, by name Eupalinos, son of Naustrophos, of whom we know nothing further. The work may have been executed under Polykrates. Rhoekos (3. 60), Telekles (3. 41), Theodoros (1. 51, 3. 41), or the two Theodori (see K. O. Müller, *Ancient Art*, E. Tr. p. 31, Overbeck, *Schriftquellen*, §§ 273 ff.), Mandrokles were native Samians. Was the remarkable painting, here put on record, the work of a Samian? Hdt. unfortunately omits the painter's name. It was not from the hand of Mandrokles (*γραψάμενος* mid.), though he may have himself composed the epigram (*ἐπιγράψας*, but cp. c. 91 *infra*) as well as the pontoon. Whether the picture was a wall-painting or a *πίναξ* is not definitely stated: presumably the former. The Heraion was a treasury of votive offerings 1. 70, and c. 152 *infra*. In Strabo's time it was a veritable *πινακοθήκη*, the collections indeed having overflowed the temple proper (p. 637).

89. 2. **δωρησάμενος . . διέβαινε.** This would seem to imply that the session or review of Dareios took place on the Asiatic side. The passage of the Great King on to European soil for the first time is an historic moment of the highest interest, and a modern historian would be likely to improve the occasion: but Hdt. is too good a story-teller to overdo such situations. Besides, he was reserving, if he had not already expended, his strength for the nearer and more thrilling parallel in the case of Xerxes.

4. **ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον.** One might suppose the mouth of the river was meant. Cp. c. 97 *infra*.

5. **ἦγον.** Not by any means necessarily "furnished the chief strength" (R.), though they may have "formed the leading members" of the navy. Cp. c. 87 *supra*.

7. **Κυανέας.** Two rocks to the north of the exit from the Bosporos. Cp. c. 85 *supra*.

ἰθύ, local: cp. c. 120 *infra*. Hdt. knows elsewhere that there is a bay to the south of the mouth of the Danube, c. 99 *infra*, but hardly realises the full sweep of the coast, or he would not have measured the greatest length of the Pontos from the Bosporos, c. 85 *supra*. In any case the fleet apparently was to make straight for the Ister. Cp. c. 99 *infra*.

9. **τὸν αὐχένα.** Not so called because you can make a head on one side and a trunk on the other, cp. c. 85 *supra*, but because it was a narrow place which admitted of being 'yoked' or 'collared.' On the topography see c. 97 *infra*.

11. **Τεάρου.** See note next chapter.

τὰς πηγὰς ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο ἡμέρας τρεῖς. ὁ δὲ Τέαρος λέγεται 90
ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων εἶναι ποταμῶν ἄριστος τά τε ἄλλα τὰ ἐς
ἄκεσιν φέροντα καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ ἵπποισι ψώρην ἀκέσασθαι.
εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ αἱ πηγαὶ δυῶν δέουσαι τεσσεράκοντα, ἐκ πέτρης
τῆς αὐτῆς ῥέουσαι, καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτέων εἰσὶ ψυχραὶ αἱ δὲ θερμαί.
ὁδὸς δ' ἐπ' αὐτάς ἐστι ἴση ἐξ Ἡραίου τε πόλιος τῆς παρὰ
Περίνθῳ καὶ ἐξ Ἀπολλωνίης τῆς ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ πόντῳ, δυῶν
ἡμερέων ἑκατέρη. ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ ὁ Τέαρος οὗτος ἐς τὸν Κοντάδεσδον
ποταμόν, ὁ δὲ Κοντάδεσδος ἐς τὸν Ἀγριάνην, ὁ δὲ Ἀγριάνης
ἐς τὸν Ἕβρον, ὁ δὲ ἐς θάλασσαν τὴν παρ' Αἴνῳ πόλι. ἐπὶ 91
τοῦτον ὦν τὸν ποταμὸν ἀπικόμενος ὁ Δαρεῖος ὡς ἐστρατο-
πεδεύσατο, ἡσθεὶς τῷ ποταμῷ στήλην ἔστησε καὶ ἐνθαῦτα,
γράμματα ἐγγράψας λέγοντα τάδε. "Τεάρου ποταμοῦ κεφαλαὶ
ὕδωρ ἄριστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον παρέχονται πάντων ποταμῶν·
καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἀπίκετο ἐλαύνων ἐπὶ Σκύθας στρατὸν ἀνὴρ ἄριστός
τε καὶ κάλλιστος πάντων ἀνθρώπων, Δαρεῖος ὁ Ὑστάσπεος,

---

90. 2. **τῶν περιοίκων.** These words do not prove that Hdt. himself visited the source of the Tearos: a local assertion probably reached him in Heraion, or Perinthos, or Apollonia, if indeed it be not derived from a literary source, or be more than an inference. Cp. Introduction, § 20. The geography of this passage has hardly received in some quarters the attention that might have been expected. The *Geogr. Journal*, 1854, vol. 24, pp. 36 ff., contains a paper, *Notes on a Journey into the Balkans, or Mount Haemus, in* 1847, by Lieut.-Gen. A. Jochmus, in which the routes of Dareios, and of Alexander, 335 B.C. (Arrian, *Anabasis*, 1, 1 ff.) are discussed. The route of Dareios through Thrace led him down to Perinthos, and then northward to the 'neck' of the Danube. He would have to pass the Balkan (Haimos), but of that Hdt. says nothing. Jochmus claims to have made out the 38 sources of the Tearos near the villages of Yene and Bunarhissar 'easily,' in which case the Tearos is the Simerdere, which has lost its medicinal properties, though keeping the number of its springs, and apparently its name (Dere, Deara). Yene is more than two days' journey from either Erekli (Perinthos) or Sizeboli (Apollonia), being 70 miles from the former, and rather more from the latter. Plainly Hdt. can hardly have visited the springs.

6. **Ἡραίου.** A Samian settlement (*Etym. Mag.*) *west* of Perinthos.

9. **Ἀγριάνης** = Ἐργῖνος or Ἐρίγων, the modern Ergene or Erkene. The Kontadesdos is apparently not identified (Jena? Forbiger, *Alte Geographie*, iii. 1075). Hebros, modern Maritza, "the greatest of the southern rivers" (of the Balkan peninsula). Stanford's *Europe*, p. 312.

10. **Αἴνῳ.** Its site more exactly described 7. 58. Strabo 319 says its old name was Poltymbria. Cp. c. 93 *infra*. Thuc. 4. 28, 7. 57.

91. 3. **ἡσθείς.** Cp. c. 88 *supra*.

4. **γράμματα ἐγγράψας.** The active in such cases can only be on the principle *qui facit per alium* (cp. *ἐπιγράψας* c. 88 *supra*). Some persons fondly believe that this inscription or "a portion of this inscription" was in existence "a few years ago" (Rawlinson *ad l.*, Jochmus, *op. c.*). That Dareios set up one or more inscriptions in Thrace is not unlikely: but that any Persian inscription contained the lines preserved by Hdt. is less likely. Cp. 1. 188 *στρατεύεται δὲ δὴ βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας καὶ σιτίοισι εὖ ἐσκευασμένος ἐξ οἴκου καὶ προβάτοισι καὶ δὴ καὶ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χοάσπεω ποταμοῦ ἅμα ἄγεται τοῦ παρὰ Σοῦσα ῥέοντος τοῦ μούνου πίνει βασιλεὺς καὶ ἄλλου οὐδενὸς ποταμοῦ.* The believers will also have it that the inscription was in cuneiform, though Hdt. does not say so (cp. c. 87 *supra*).

Περσέων τε καὶ πάσης τῆς ἠπείρου βασιλεύς." ταῦτα δὲ ἐνθαῦτα ἐγράφη.

92 Δαρεῖος δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμηθεὶς ἀπίκετο ἐπ' ἄλλον ποταμὸν
τῷ οὔνομα Ἀρτησκός ἐστι, ὃς διὰ Ὀδρυσέων ῥέει. ἐπὶ τοῦτον
δὴ τὸν ποταμὸν ἀπικόμενος ἐποίησε τοιόνδε· ἀποδέξας χωρίον
τῇ στρατιῇ ἐκέλευε πάντα ἄνδρα λίθον ἕνα παρεξιόντα τιθέναι
ἐς τὸ ἀποδεδεγμένον τοῦτο χωρίον. ὡς δὲ ταῦτα ἡ στρατιὴ
ἐπετέλεσε, ἐνθαῦτα κολωνοὺς μεγάλους τῶν λίθων καταλιπὼν
93 ἀπήλαυνε τὴν στρατιήν. πρὶν δὲ ἀπικέσθαι ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον,
πρώτους αἱρέει Γέτας τοὺς ἀθανατίζοντας. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν
Σαλμυδησσὸν ἔχοντες Θρήικες καὶ ὑπὲρ Ἀπολλωνίης τε καὶ

---

8. **ἠπείρου** is explained to mean Asia (cp. 1. 4), the King apparently not being aware that he was in Europe!

92. 2. **Ἀρτησκός.** If the Artiskos were correctly identified by d'Anville and Gattener with the Arda or Arta (see Larcher viii. p. 52), Dareios would have had to cross the Maritza (Hebros) before coming to it. This would destroy the credit of Hdt. Jochmus followed by Rawlinson identifies it with the Teke-dereh which is crossed *several times* on the present high road to the Balkan. Of the maps some place the Artiskos on the W., others on the E. of the Hebros; owing to the above difference among the geographers.

διὰ Ὀδρυσέων, Thuc. 2. 96. Adrianople (Uscadama) now stands about the centre of the great plain which formed apparently the territory of the Odrysae, probably separated from the Getae by the Balkan, until their frontier was pushed forward to the Danube by Sitalkes, c. 80 *supra*. But it is possible that the Odrysae at this period (512 B.C.) lay wholly west of the Hebros, in which case Dareios did not march through their territory. It is certainly curious that no notice is taken of their fate.

3. **τοιόνδε.** This performance looks like a rude attempt at a count of the army, else why the 'one man one stone'? Cp. cc. 81 *supra*, 98 *infra*, 7. 60.

93. 1. **πρίν.** It is curious that Hdt. does not mention the Balkans or specify by what pass Dareios crossed from the territory of the Odrysae to that of the Getae. If Dareios crossed as far to the E. as Jochmus supposed, with a view to getting him to Apollonia, it is strange that the fleet should have been sent *ἰθὺ* to the Danube c. 89 *supra*, and that we hear nothing of the king's presence in the Greek cities on the Thracian coast of the Pontos. Hdt. indeed knew at some time in his life that there was a block of mountains between the Danube and Thrace called Haimos, cp. c. 49 *supra*, but his geography and geographical excursus are independent of his history, and his history of his geography: the sources he follows here for Dareios' campaign made no mention of mountains or passes. Cp. Appendix II.

2. **Γέτας.** The Getae, here first mentioned in history, are identified with the Goths by Rawlinson who compares Massa-getae, Thyssa-getae, Tyri-getae, Visi-goths, Ostro-goths. The identification is very doubtful. See Müllenhoff, *Deutsch. Alterthumsk.* iii. 162. Their home lay apparently between the Balkans and the Danube. Bulgaria after the treaty of Berlin, 1878, represented the territory of the Getae of Hdt. Cp. Fyffe, *Mod. Europe*, iii. 518.

3. **Σαλμυδησσόν.** The name is perhaps connected with that of the Thracian deity Σάλμ-οξις, the termination -assos, -essos, -issos being prae-Hellenic. Porphyry, *Vit. Pythag.* 14, preserves a Thracian word ζαλμὸς = δορά.

Salmydessos, Apollonia, and Mesambria are all on the W. coast of Pontos. They are mentioned in order from S. to N. Mesambria the most northerly is south of Haemus, south of which therefore the Kyrmianae and Nipsaei must be placed. Salmydessos was a wild coast where 'wrecking' was organised, see Xen. *Anab.* 7. 5. 13. Athenians did not know much about it, if it be this Salmydessos that Aischyl. *Prom.* 726 locates

Μεσαμβρίης πόλιος οἰκημένοι, καλεύμενοι δὲ Κυρμιάναι καὶ Νιψαῖοι, ἀμαχητὶ σφέας αὐτοὺς παρέδοσαν Δαρείῳ· οἱ δὲ Γέται πρὸς ἀγνωμοσύνην τραπόμενοι αὐτίκα ἐδουλώθησαν, Θρηίκων ἐόντες ἀνδρηιότατοι καὶ δικαιότατοι. 94 *ἀθανατίζουσι δὲ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον· οὔτε ἀποθνήσκειν ἑωυτοὺς νομίζουσι ἰέναι τε τὸν ἀπολλύμενον παρὰ Σάλμοξιν δαίμονα· οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον ὀνομάζουσι Γεβελέιζιν· διὰ πεντετηρίδος τε τὸν πάλῳ λαχόντα αἰεὶ σφεων αὐτῶν ἀποπέμπουσι ἄγγελον παρὰ τὸν Σάλμοξιν, ἐντελλόμενοι τῶν ἂν ἑκάστοτε δέωνται, πέμπουσι δὲ ὧδε· οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ταχθέντες ἀκόντια τρία ἔχουσι, ἄλλοι δὲ διαλαβόντες τοῦ ἀποπεμπομένου παρὰ τὸν Σάλμοξιν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας, ἀνακινήσαντες αὐτὸν μετέωρον ῥίπτουσι ἐς τὰς λόγχας. ἢν μὲν δὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἀναπαρείς, τοῖσι δὲ ἵλεος ὁ θεὸς δοκέει εἶναι· ἢν δὲ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, αἰτιῶνται αὐτὸν τὸν ἄγγελον, φάμενοί μιν ἄνδρα κακὸν εἶναι, αἰτιησάμενοι δὲ τοῦτον ἄλλον ἀποπέμπουσι· ἐντέλλονται δὲ ἔτι ζῶντι. οὗτοι οἱ αὐτοὶ Θρήικες καὶ πρὸς βροντήν τε καὶ ἀστραπὴν τοξεύοντες ἄνω πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀπειλέουσι τῷ θεῷ, οὐδένα ἄλλον θεὸν νομίζοντες εἶναι εἰ μὴ*

---

in Asia, and the names of the tribes here given are doubtful. Apollonia, see c. 90 *supra*.

Mesambria is not to be confused with the town mentioned 7. 108. Oddly enough Hdt. appears in 6. 33 *infra* to date the colonisation of this Mesambria after the Ionic revolt, though he here seems to imply that it was in existence when Dareios went by. He ascribes it to fugitives of Byzantion and Chalkedon: in later times it was traced to Megara the metropolis of those cities, Strabo 319. *-bria* was Thracian for a town: Steph. Byz. who gives Selymbria, Poltymbria as further examples. Cp. Strabo 319. It has been thought that Mesambria formed one member of a pentapolis, the others being Apollonia to the south, and Odessos, Kallatis, Tomi to the north. *C.I.G.* ii. p. 79, 2056 c, note.

7. **δικαιότατοι.** These Getae had some virtues, *ἀνδρία, δικαιοσύνη*, but they lacked *σοφία* or they would not have been guilty of *ἀγνωμοσύνη*. Cp. 2. 172 *σοφίῃ . . οὐκ ἀγνωμοσύνῃ*. Add 7. 9.

94. 1. **ἀθανατίζουσι.** Cp. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology* (tr. Stallybrass) cc. xxvii. on Death, *ad init.* "To the olden time death was not a being that killed, but simply one that fetched away and escorted to the underworld." And so elsewhere (*op. cit.* i. 145) Grimm quotes the phrase *ἰέναι παρὰ Σάλμοξιν* as parallel to the Northern phrase "faring to Odin."

3. **Σάλμοξιν.** The name is variously given as *Σάλμοξις, Ζάλμοξις, Ζάμολξις, Ζάλμολξις* (Stein).

4. **διὰ πεντετηρίδος** looks rather Hellenic. Savages seldom, if ever, have regular festivals at such long intervals, which imply a developed calendar.

πάλῳ. This method was democratic and just! 3. 80.

7. **διαλαβόντες.** Cp. c. 68 *supra*.

10. **τοῖσι δὲ ἵλεος.** *δὲ in apodosi.* Cp. c. 68 *supra*. *ἵλεος* 6. 91.

15. **τῷ θεῷ.** As the Greeks considered it. This primitive monotheism is almost unintelligible to the tolerant Greek polytheist, and is apparently not reckoned to the credit of the Getae, who showed perhaps in religion as in policy a certain *ἀγνωμοσύνη*. At the same time the absurdity to Hdt. is rather in a Thracian god being the only deity, than in the idea of there being but one God; as he was not altogether a stranger to the monotheistic tendency of his own age and people (cp. Introduction, § 22), even though there is nothing in

95 τὸν σφέτερον. ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι τῶν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον οἰκεόντων Ἑλλήνων [καὶ Πόντον], τὸν Σάλμοξιν τοῦτον ἐόντα ἄνθρωπον δουλεῦσαι ἐν Σάμῳ, δουλεῦσαι δὲ Πυθαγόρῃ τῷ Μνησάρχου, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ αὐτὸν γενόμενον ἐλεύθερον χρήματα κτήσασθαι μεγάλα, κτησάμενον δὲ ἀπελθεῖν ἐς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ. ἅτε δὲ κακοβίων τε ἐόντων τῶν Θρηίκων καὶ ὑπαφρονεστέρων, τὸν Σάλμοξιν τοῦτον ἐπιστάμενον δίαιτάν τε Ἰάδα καὶ ἤθεα βαθύτερα ἢ κατὰ Θρήικας, οἷα Ἕλλησί τε ὁμιλήσαντα καὶ Ἑλλήνων οὐ τῷ ἀσθενεστάτῳ σοφιστῇ Πυθαγόρῃ, κατασκευάσασθαι ἀνδρεῶνα, ἐς τὸν πανδοκεύοντα τῶν ἀστῶν τοὺς πρώτους καὶ εὐωχέοντα ἀναδιδάσκειν ὡς οὔτε αὐτὸς οὔτε οἱ συμπόται αὐτοῦ οὔτε οἱ ἐκ τούτων αἰεὶ γινόμενοι ἀποθανέονται,

---

his ideas that can be put beside the utterance of Xenophanes of Kolophon:

εἷς θεὸς ἔν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος
οὔ τι δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοίιος οὐδὲ νόημα.

Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5, p. 601 c. (Ritter and Preller, § 133.)

95. 1. **Ἑλλήσποντον.** Evidently used here rather of the Propontis. Cp. c. 85 *supra*.

2. **Ἑλλήνων.** These Greeks were Euhemerists before Euhemerus, at least in regard to this particular case. The 'historicising' method had been introduced presumably by the first Logographi, Genealogists, Historians, perhaps partly as an adaptation of the wisdom of the Egyptians (2. 43, 143), and is illustrated by Hdt. himself (2. 44, *et al.*) as well as by Thucydides (1. 3, 4, 2. 15, esp. 2. 29). After much discredit it has been revived in a somewhat extreme form in our own day by Mr. Herbert Spencer (esp. in his *Ecclesiastical Institutions*). That within certain limits it is a genuine method in accordance with facts has been virtually demonstrated by Sir A. Lyall's *Asiatic Studies*.

6. **ὑπαφρονεστέρων.** It is likely enough that the sharp-witted Greeks often got the better of these Getae in their bargains. So "Large quantities [of gunflints !] are annually exported from London to the Gold Coast for the interior of Africa, where a brisk trade is still done with the confiding aborigines" *Mag. of Art.* Oct. 1887. (African travellers do not all seem to find the aborigines confiding, but rather cunning and hard bargainers, see W. M. Kerr, *The Far Interior*, ii. 121, 233 *et passim*.)

7. **ἤθεα.** It may be doubted whether his morals had been improved by contact with Hellenes, especially Ionians. Some commentators here find a deliberate hit at the Ionians. Stein sees intentional irony in this passage, and argues from it that Hdt. disliked the Pythagoreans: comparing 2. 123 *ad fin.* In regard to Pythagoras and his doctrines and rule of life, there is very little to show that Hdt. understood, or knew much about them: otherwise we might have expected more information concerning the position and influence of the Pythagoreans in Italy than he affords. In regard to the passage 2. 123: admitting that there is a reference to Pythagoras, the way it is made shows consideration and respect, rather than dislike. Cp. c. 43 *supra*.

Hdt. has a slight anti-Ionian feeling (cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.), but in the passage before us here I can see no intentional irony. Stein finds it in ἤθεα β. and δίαιτα Ἰάς. What then is to be said of Ἕλλησι ? The word σοφιστής, which a few years later would perhaps have shown malice prepense, has no dyslogistic force in Hdt.; cp. 1. 29. There is indeed irony in this passage, but it is unconscious, the self-exposure of those Greeks whose mouth-piece for the moment is Hdt., though he himself does not credit the tale, and charges them with an anachronism. And there is also malice in the story, which must be put down to these Greeks of Pontos, among whom Samos and the Samians were no doubt unpopular, they themselves mostly hailing from Miletos or Megara.

ἀλλ' ἥξουσι ἐς χῶρον τοῦτον ἵνα αἰεὶ περιεόντες ἕξουσι τὰ πάντα ἀγαθά. ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἐποίεε τὰ καταλεχθέντα καὶ ἔλεγε ταῦτα, ἐν τούτῳ κατάγαιον οἴκημα ἐποιέετο. ὡς δέ οἱ παντελέως εἶχε τὸ οἴκημα, ἐκ μὲν τῶν Θρηίκων ἠφανίσθη, καταβὰς δὲ κάτω ἐς τὸ κατάγαιον οἴκημα διαιτᾶτο ἐπ' ἔτεα τρία· οἱ δέ μιν ἐπόθεόν τε καὶ ἐπένθεον ὡς τεθνεῶτα. τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτεϊ ἐφάνη τοῖσι Θρήιξι, καὶ οὕτω πιθανά σφι ἐγένετο τὰ ἔλεγε ὁ Σάλμοξις.
ταῦτα φασί μιν ποιῆσαι. ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν [τούτου καὶ] τοῦ 96
καταγαίου οἰκήματος οὔτε ἀπιστέω οὔτε ὦν πιστεύω τι λίην, δοκέω δὲ πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον τὸν Σάλμοξιν τοῦτον γενέσθαι Πυθαγόρεω. εἴτε δὲ ἐγένετό τις Σάλμοξις ἄνθρωπος, εἴτ' ἐστὶ δαίμων τις Γέτῃσι οὗτος ἐπιχώριος, χαιρέτω.

Οὗτοι μὲν δὴ τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ χρεώμενοι ὡς ἐχειρώθησαν 97
ὑπὸ Περσέων, εἵποντο τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατῷ. Δαρεῖος δὲ ὡς ἀπίκετο καὶ ὁ πεζὸς ἅμ' αὐτῷ στρατὸς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον, ἐνθαῦτα δια-

---

19. **οὕτω.** The absurdity lay not in their accepting his doctrines upon the strength of a miracle, but in their being taken in by a sham miracle. The way in which these Pontine Greeks rationalised away the traditions, or beliefs, of their Thracian neighbours, on the imposture hypothesis, resembles in more than one respect some of the rationalistic paradoxes of the last century.

Strabo 297 f., 303 f. tells the story of Zamolxis (*sic*) without any malice or irony. According to the version followed by him this Geta, Zamolxis, had been in the service of Pythagoras, and had visited Egypt and other places. On his return to his native land he rose to great power, persuaded the king to associate him with himself in authority, became priest of the deity *most* honoured among the Getae, withdrew himself from the public to a cave, and was by and by recognised as a divinity. It is the same story told in a kindlier vein, and revived perhaps in the days of Strabo in the interests of that Byrebistas who seemed likely to be troublesome to the Romans, and who had an ἀνὴρ γόης, Dekaineos, in his train, who had been in Egypt and learnt its wisdom, and re-enacted the rôle ascribed to Zamolxis. The 'total abstinence' of the Getae, which in Strabo is represented as a result of local option with them under the influence of the wizard, may have been long a matter of fact; the Pontine Greeks indeed seem to insinuate that it was hardly a matter of choice (κακόβιοι), but though in Strabo the abstinence of the Getae is traced back to the influence of Zamolxis, in the passage before us a contrary influence is ascribed to him.

(Stein sees a possible allusion to this passage in Soph. *El.* 62.)

96. 3. **δοκέω.** Otherwise (perhaps Hdt. thinks) there would not have been time for the development of the rite described in c. 94, as actually practised by the Getae. The death of Pythagoras at an advanced age is variously dated 499 B.C., 472 B.C. See Clinton, *Fast. H. ad ann.* But cp. Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, p. 45 (E. T.), Burnet, *Early Gk. Phil.* p. 93.

4. **εἴτε.** The alternatives are not really exclusive of each other: the apotheosis and divinisation of men (and women) being a genuine and widespread process. See Spencer, Lyall, *opp. cit. supra*, note, c. 95 l. 2.

97. 2. **εἵποντο.** The numbers above given, c. 87, would thereby have been augmented, or at least maintained: but no notice of this result is taken.

3. **ἅμ' αὐτῷ.** The position of the words is peculiar, as we hear of no land forces beside those with the king, unless τὸν ἐκ τῶν νεῶν στρατὸν *infra* be so understood. β (PRVS) omit the words.

ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον. Where did Dareios and his forces cross the river?

The opening words of c. 89 *supra* might naturally be taken to mean that the fleet was ordered to sail to the

βάντων πάντων Δαρεῖος ἐκέλευσε τούς τε Ἴωνας τὴν σχεδίην λύσαντας ἕπεσθαι κατ' ἤπειρον ἑωυτῷ καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῶν νεῶν στρατόν. μελλόντων δὲ τῶν Ἰώνων λύειν καὶ ποιέειν τὰ κελευόμενα, Κώης ὁ Ἐρξάνδρου στρατηγὸς ἐὼν Μυτιληναίων ἔλεξε Δαρείῳ τάδε, πυθόμενος πρότερον εἴ οἱ φίλον εἴη γνώμην ἀποδέκεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ βουλομένου ἀποδείκνυσθαι. "ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐπὶ γῆν γὰρ μέλλεις στρατεύεσθαι τῆς οὔτε ἀρηρομένον φανήσεται οὐδὲν οὔτε πόλις οἰκεομένη· σύ νυν γέφυραν ταύτην ἔα κατὰ χώρην ἑστάναι, φυλάκους αὐτῆς λιπὼν τούτους οἵπερ μιν ἔζευξαν. καὶ ἤν τε κατὰ νόον πρήξωμεν εὑρόντες Σκύθας, ἔστι ἄποδος ἡμῖν, ἤν τε καὶ μή σφεας εὑρεῖν δυνώμεθα, ἥ γε ἄποδος

---

mouth of the Danube, throw a pontoon across the river there, and await the king's arrival. So Rawlinson translates. If so, the king's orders were disobeyed, for the fleet advanced two days up the river to 'the neck,' and there constructed the pontoon. This point is now reached by Dareios; and as everything goes smoothly we must suppose that the *rendezvous* was according to orders. We might conjecture that the king was ignorant of there being more than one channel, or mouth, if it were worth while to harmonise such discrepancies: and was easily satisfied that the Ionians had obeyed the spirit of his orders. Where is the neck to be located? Stein and Blakesley do not raise the question. Rawlinson practically gives it up as insoluble (vol. iii. pp. 79, 80). Was the passage effected at the mouth or mouths by ship? or up the river at 'the neck' on a pontoon? or elsewhere, higher up? or was it ever effected at all? Is the bridging of the Ister a reduplication of the bridging of the Bosporos? Such questions may legitimately be raised, especially in the light of the improbabilities of the story which follows. (Cp. Appendix III.) But on the whole it seems credible that Dareios crossed the Ister, perhaps in the vicinity of Galatz, possibly much higher up than two days' row, a small contingent of the fleet being sent up the stream to throw a bridge across, while the greater portion of the fleet remained at the mouth. The majority of the craft sent up the river must surely have been used for the bridge itself, and perhaps the Greek ships were specially employed on this service. Cp. cc. 83, 87, 89 *supra*.

5. **λύσαντας.** Is it to be supposed that the bridge was to be broken up and the whole fleet abandoned? Or were the ships to be sent down stream and home? Or what was to be the service of the fleet? This command to the Ionians is unintelligible, except on the supposition that Dareios was going round by the Kaukasos. Cp. Appendix III.

7. **Κώης.** This name was remembered perhaps from his fate in the Ionian revolt afterwards. He was only στρατηγὸς at this time: the τυραννὶς was understood to have been the reward of his services on this occasion 5. 37. Cp. c. 137 *infra*.

Μυτιληναίων. The reduction of Lesbos has not been previously specified.

8. **πυθόμενος πρότερον.** A charming touch, full of verisimilitude, and just what a Greek story-teller would introduce as characteristic of oriental court-life. Rawlinson compares the inquiry of Kroisos 1. 88, an item no doubt equally true or equally fictitious.

10. **ἀρηρομένον.** Are we to suppose that the plough was introduced among the Scythian Georgi and Aroteres subsequent to the expedition of Dareios? or that Dareios was not going against the district where the Aroteres and Georgi were to be found (cp. 7. 10), or that Koes was ignorant of the existence of agriculture in Scythia? or that the story is a free creation?

Mutatis mutandis, the same remarks apply to the assertion that there were no πόλεις in the land to be invaded: there were at least the Greek colonies on the Scythic coast; to say nothing of Gelonus (πόλις ξυλίνη c. 108) which Dareios is represented as taking (c. 123).

ἡμῖν ἀσφαλής· οὐ γὰρ ἔδεισά κω μὴ ἑσσωθέωμεν ὑπὸ Σκυθέων μάχῃ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μὴ οὐ δυνάμενοί σφεας εὑρεῖν πάθωμέν τι ἀλώμενοι. καὶ τάδε λέγειν φαίη τις ἄν με ἐμεωυτοῦ εἵνεκεν, ὡς καταμένω· ἐγὼ δὲ γνώμην μὲν τὴν εὕρισκον ἀρίστην σοί, βασιλεῦ, ἐς μέσον φέρω, αὐτὸς μέντοι ἕψομαί τοι καὶ οὐκ ἂν λειφθείην." κάρτα τε ἥσθη τῇ γνώμῃ Δαρεῖος καί μιν ἀμείψατο τοισίδε. "ξεῖνε Λέσβιε, σωθέντος ἐμεῦ ὀπίσω ἐς οἶκον τὸν ἐμὸν ἐπιφάνηθί μοι πάντως, ἵνα σε ἀντὶ χρηστῆς συμβουλίης χρηστοῖσι ἔργοισι ἀμείψωμαι." ταῦτα δὲ εἴπας καὶ ἀπάψας ἅμματα ἑξήκοντα ἐν 98
ἱμάντι, καλέσας ἐς λόγους τοὺς Ἰώνων τυράννους ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ἡ μὲν πρότερον γνώμη ἀποδεχθεῖσα ἐς τὴν γέφυραν μετείσθω μοι, ἔχοντες δὲ τὸν ἱμάντα τόνδε ποιέετε τάδε· ἐπεὰν ἐμὲ ἴδητε τάχιστα πορευόμενον ἐπὶ Σκύθας, ἀπὸ τούτου ἀρξάμενοι τοῦ χρόνου λύετε ἅμμα ἓν ἑκάστης ἡμέρης· ἢν δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ μὴ παρέω ἀλλὰ διεξέλθωσι ὑμῖν αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἁμμάτων, ἀποπλέετε ἐς τὴν ὑμετέρην αὐτῶν. μέχρι δὲ τούτου, ἐπείτε οὕτω μετέδοξε, φυλάσσετε τὴν σχεδίην, πᾶσαν προθυμίην σωτηρίης τε καὶ φυλακῆς παρεχόμενοι. ταῦτα δὲ

---

19. **οὐκ ἂν λειφθείην.** Rawlinson remarks that "after the punishment of Oiobazos (c. 84 *supra*) it was important to guard against this suspicion." No doubt the two anecdotes serve to set each other off admirably: this observation partly explains them: but it is paying their verisimilitude too high a compliment to make the contrast a basis for such material inferences.

20. **κάρτα τε ἥσθη.** Cp. c. 88 *supra*.

98. 1. **ἅμματα ἑξήκοντα.** These sixty knots, or days, play a considerable part in the sequel: cc. 133, 136 ff. But so much the worse for the whole story. That the knotted cord (Peruvian, *Quipu*) is an authentic method of reckoning among primitive folks cannot be doubted. Cp. Tylor, *Early History of Mankind*[2], pp. 156 ff. There are some strings of this character in the Pitt Rivers collection at Oxford, one in particular, connected with observances after a great man's death, in which the knots are reinforced by bits of tortoise-shell for the 'red-letter days': and an exact parallel to the story here recorded is to be found in the action of the naked but gentle savage, Abba Thulle, described by Keate (*Pelew Islands*, London 1788, p. 223): "Between the hours of two and three a messenger from the northwards arriving, the king was thereupon awakened by one of his attendants, who brought in a lighted torch; he instantly arose and ordered the messenger to be introduced; after holding some conversation with him, the king delivered to him a piece of cord, on which he had tied as many knots as there would be days before our people purposed to sail." The number of days was apparently only six or seven, cp. *op. c.* p. 216 for a second instance. But that the Great King dealing with Ionian Greeks at the close of the sixth century, had recourse to so simple a device for assisting them in counting two moons and four days is hardly credible. As well suppose that Kleisthenes of Sikyon reckoned time by so primitive a device, when he invited the Suitors to Sikyon 6. 126 *infra*: or that Hdt. is satirising the Ionians. The device is probably *geographically* true: *i.e.* it may have been employed by the Greek traders in their intercourse with the natives of the steppes, or by the natives among themselves.

What inference they were to draw should he not reappear within the sixty days the king left the Ionians to guess; nor has Hdt. enlightened his readers on this point.

ποιεῦντες ἐμοὶ μεγάλως χαριεῖσθε." Δαρεῖος μὲν ταῦτα εἴπας ἐς τὸ πρόσω ἐπείγετο.

99 Τῆς δὲ Σκυθικῆς γῆς ἡ Θρηίκη τὸ ἐς θάλασσαν πρόκειται· κόλπου δὲ ἀγομένου τῆς γῆς ταύτης, ἡ Σκυθική τε ἐκδέκεται καὶ ὁ Ἴστρος ἐκδιδοῖ ἐς αὐτήν, πρὸς εὖρον ἄνεμον τὸ στόμα τετραμμένος. τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ Ἴστρου ἔρχομαι σημανέων τὸ πρὸς θάλασσαν αὐτῆς τῆς Σκυθικῆς χώρης ἐς μέτρησιν. ἀπὸ Ἴστρου αὕτη ἤδη ἡ ἀρχαίη Σκυθίη ἐστί, πρὸς μεσαμβρίην τε καὶ νότον ἄνεμον κειμένη, μέχρι πόλιος Καρκινίτιδος καλεομένης. τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν τὴν αὐτὴν φέρουσαν, ἐοῦσαν ὀρει-

---

99. 1. τῆς δὲ Σκυθικῆς γῆς. We revert to geography (99-101) and ethnography (103-117), connected or separated by narrative (c. 102). A modern historian would have proceeded more systematically; first saying all he had to say on land and people, and then giving an unbroken narrative of events. This is not Hdt.'s manner. But whether his method is determined entirely by free choice, or does not betray the eclectic character of his work, the variety of its sources, and the discontinuity in its composition, are questions not to be hastily answered in favour of free choice. See Introduction, § 20, and Appendix II.

Stein suggests that in the original MS. a map was here inserted. But it would be a map without rivers: the Scythia of the narrative portion needs no map. The map would have been more in place in illustration of cc. 16-20. But there is no evidence, or hint of such cartography, on Hdt.'s part.

πρόκειται. Stein compares 2. 12 which proves that Hdt. here means that Thrace projects farther into the sea than Scythia: that there is any reference to the Mediterranean I cannot see. Hdt. knows that the east coast of Thrace is hollowed into a bay (*κόλπου δὲ ἀγ. τ. γ. τ.*) succeeded by a projection, succeeded by Scythia. How the river can be said to empty itself into the land instead of into the sea is rather obscure. Stein makes *ἐκδιδοῖ* refer to the whole distance for which the river is to be conceived as forming the boundary between Thrace and Scythia, and compares c. 49 *ἐς τὰ πλάγια τῆς Σκυθικῆς ἐσβάλλει.* Rawlinson boldly translates "into the sea." Hdt.'s language is obscure because his ideas are confused.

3. **τὸ στόμα.** Hdt. thinks of the Ister higher up as forming the frontier practically parallel with the (imaginary) coast of Maeotis and the Tanais boundary. The correct lie of the mouth was however known to him. In c. 47 *supra* he has described the river as having five mouths (like the Nile, 2. 10).

6. **ἀρχαίη.** If this meant 'original' from which the Kimmerians had been longest driven out, as Rawlinson holds, then it would appear that the Scyths entered Scythia from the west. Stein explains it as meaning merely 'Scythia *proper*': but in the four parallel passages quoted by him 1. 75, 2. 24, 7. 184, 9. 48, there is a contrast between two conditions *temporally* removed from each other (of river, sun, fleet, army), and though his term *ursprünglich* is applicable, the term *eigentlich* is questionable.

I suggest that here the word is used not from a Scythian source but from a Greek: 'Old Scythia' is the part of Scythia where corn was cultivated, and society comparatively settled, and with which the Greeks had longest had dealings.

7. **Καρκινίτιδος,** c. 55 *supra*, *πόλις Κ.* = *Κάρκινα* or *Καρκίνη*. See Smith, *Dict. Geogr. sub v.* (i. 515 b) and Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* iii. 1118. (*Κάρκινα sic apud* Ptol. 3. 5, 27. The word *καρκίνος* has a heteroclite pl. *καρκίνα*, cp. L. & S. *sub v.*)

τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης. Hdt. is describing the Crimea which forms in his mind a sort of prolongation of the south and east coasts of Scythia, resembling the tip of Attica, or the heel of Italy. It is evident that he does not know the correct shape of the Crimea, nor the fact that it is attached to the mainland by a narrow isthmus. Rawlinson (iii.

νήν τε χώρην καὶ προκειμένην τὸ ἐς Πόντον, νέμεται τὸ Ταυρικὸν
ἔθνος μέχρι χερσονήσου τῆς τρηχέης καλεομένης· αὕτη δὲ ἐς
θάλασσαν τὴν πρὸς ἀπηλιώτην ἄνεμον κατήκει. ἔστι γὰρ τῆς
Σκυθικῆς τὰ δύο μέρεα τῶν οὔρων ἐς θάλασσαν φέροντα, τήν τε
πρὸς μεσαμβρίην καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ, κατά περ τῆς Ἀττικῆς
χώρης· καὶ παραπλήσια ταύτῃ καὶ οἱ Ταῦροι νέμονται τῆς
Σκυθικῆς, ὡς εἰ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ μὴ Ἀθηναῖοι
νεμοίατο τὸν γουνὸν τὸν Σουνιακόν, μᾶλλον ἐς τὸν πόντον [τὴν
ἄκρην] ἀνέχοντα, τὸν ἀπὸ Θορικοῦ μέχρι Ἀναφλύστου δήμου·
λέγω δὲ ὡς εἶναι ταῦτα σμικρὰ μεγάλοισι συμβάλλειν· τοιοῦτον
ἡ Ταυρική ἐστι. ὃς δὲ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ταῦτα μὴ παραπέπλωκε,
ἐγὼ δὲ ἄλλως δηλώσω· ὡς εἰ τῆς Ἰηπυγίης ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ μὴ
Ἰήπυγες ἀρξάμενοι ἐκ Βρεντεσίου λιμένος ἀποταμοίατο μέχρι
Τάραντος καὶ νεμοίατο τὴν ἄκρην. δύο δὲ λέγων ταῦτα πολλὰ
λέγω παρόμοια, τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ἔοικε ἡ Ταυρική. τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τῆς 100
Ταυρικῆς ἤδη Σκύθαι τὰ κατύπερθε τῶν Ταύρων καὶ τὰ πρὸς
θαλάσσης τῆς ἠοίης νέμονται, τοῦ τε Βοσπόρου τοῦ Κιμμερίου
τὰ πρὸς ἑσπέρης καὶ τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαιήτιδος μέχρι Τανάιδος
ποταμοῦ, ὃς ἐκδιδοῖ ἐς μυχὸν τῆς λίμνης ταύτης. ἤδη ὦν ἀπὸ
μὲν Ἴστρου τὰ κατύπερθε ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέροντα ἀποκληίεται
ἡ Σκυθικὴ ὑπὸ πρώτων Ἀγαθύρσων, μετὰ δὲ Νευρῶν, ἔπειτα
δὲ Ἀνδροφάγων, τελευταίων δὲ Μελαγχλαίνων. ἔστι ὦν τῆς 101
Σκυθικῆς ὡς ἐούσης τετραγώνου, τῶν δύο μερέων κατηκόντων ἐς

---

88) suggests, as usual, that Hdt. is right for his own day, and that the Putrid Sea has come into existence since.

That Hdt.'s illustration which applies to Attica can only have been written after a visit to Athens, and that referring to the Iapygian promontory after a visit to Italy, is almost self-evident. What is not so generally remarked is that both illustrations may be insertions, that the second looks specially like an addition, and that in any case the passage is not calculated in the first instance for an Italiote audience, or the order of the illustrations would have been reversed.

100. 2. **τὰ πρὸς θαλάσσης τῆς ἠοίης.** Explained by the words which follow as including parts on the Kimmerian Bosporos (cp. cc. 12, 83 *supra*) and the Palus Maeotis. It would therefore appear that Hdt. in this place conceives the corner inhabited by the Tauri as extending below the Kimmerian Bosporos, the western shore of which is inhabited by Scyths. The length of the K. Bosporos he does not specify.

5. **ἀπὸ Ἴστρου.** That must be from the north-west corner of Scythia where the Ister first strikes τὰ πλάγια τῆς Σκυθίης c. 49 *supra*.

6. **τὰ κατύπερθε ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέροντα**, *i.e.* the parts inland and north of a line drawn from the (hypothetical) bend of the Ister, parallel with the south coast of Scythia, and extending to the Maeotis, or to a point on the Tanais 20 days (4000 st.) inland (upstream) from the (open) sea, outside the Kimmerian Bosporos. Those parts are occupied by four tribes, enumerated from W. to E.: Agathyrsi, Neuri, Androphagi, Melanchlaeni. This tribal order is one of Hdt.'s fixed ideas, cp. cc. 102, 125, though the Agathyrsi do not appear with the Neuri, Androphagi, Melanchlaeni in the geography, cc. 17-20. Cp. Appendix II.

101. 2. **ὡς ἐούσης τετραγώνου**, 'assum-

θάλασσαν, πάντῃ ἴσον τό τε ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέρον καὶ τὸ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. ἀπὸ γὰρ Ἴστρου ἐπὶ Βορυσθένεα δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδός, ἀπὸ Βορυσθένεός τε ἐπὶ τὴν λίμνην τὴν Μαιῆτιν ἑτερέων δέκα· καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐς μεσόγαιαν ἐς τοὺς Μελαγχλαίνους τοὺς κατύπερθε Σκυθέων οἰκημένους εἴκοσι ἡμερέων ὁδός. ἡ δὲ ὁδὸς ἡ ἡμερησίη ἀνὰ διηκόσια στάδια συμβέβληταί μοι. οὕτω ἂν εἴη τῆς Σκυθικῆς τὰ ἐπικάρσια τετρακισχιλίων σταδίων καὶ τὰ ὄρθια τὰ ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέροντα ἑτέρων τοσούτων σταδίων. ἡ μέν νυν γῆ αὕτη ἐστὶ μέγαθος τοσαύτη.

102 Οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι δόντες σφίσι λόγον ὡς οὐκ οἷοί τέ εἰσι τὸν Δαρείου στρατὸν ἰθυμαχίῃ διώσασθαι μοῦνοι, ἔπεμπον ἐς τοὺς

---

ing as he may that it is quadrangular': the words which follow (*πάντῃ ἴσον*) and the measurements there detailed, and the total absence of any further specifications in regard to the two sides not here described, leave no doubt that Hdt. in this passage represents Scythia as practically a square of 20 days' journey, or 4000 stades (*c.* 460 m.), each way. Of these sides the south is formed by the sea coast from the Istros to the Palus (excluding *Ταυρική* just described, c. 99); the east by the coast of the Palus, and, presumably, the lower part of the Tanais; the north side, by a row of four non-Scythian tribes (the natural frontier on that side would have been the desert or lakes elsewhere specified, cp. Appendix II.), while the west side of Scythia is formed apparently by the Istros and Thrace. That the lower course of the Tanais forms part of the E. frontier of Scythia is suggested by c. 122, cp. c. 21. Stein's map is therefore not correct in drawing the ideal north frontier line from the mouth of Tanais: except indeed that Hdt. expresses himself in terms hardly consistent with one another, see *infra*, next note and Appendix II.

τῶν δύο μερέων, 'the south and east, being bordered by salt water,' *i.e.* by Pontus and Palus. Hdt.'s employment of the terms *τὸ ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέρον*, *τὸ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐς μεσόγαιαν*, *τὸ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν*, and *τὰ κατύπερθε ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέροντα* (c. 100 *supra*) leaves a good deal to be desired. There are here four terms employed, but only three sides of Scythia clearly indicated, the western side remaining here unspecified. The two first terms here cited plainly refer to the same side, the eastern, which might consistently with Hdt.'s conception have been also described as *παρὰ θάλασσαν* since he conceives the Palus, which he also describes as *θάλασσα*, to form (in part) its limit, and has indeed just asserted that Scythia is bounded by salt water on *two* sides. *τὸ παρὰ θ.* is plainly the south side. *τὰ κατύπερθε ἐς τ. μ. φ.* as plainly the parallel northern side. The western side which would also have been rightly described as *ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέρον* is not specified. It is, however, to be conceived as bounded by the Ister, cp. Appendix II.

102. 1. **δόντες σφίσι λόγον**, c. 77 *supra*, 6. 138, etc. How Hdt. came by all the exact information that follows regarding what passed in the councils of the Scyths, it does not fall within his province, as he conceives, to specify: how much in the form of the story is Hdt.'s own work it is perhaps impossible to determine: only one thing is clear, that we are not dealing with historical details. Not merely is there too little evidence that these matters did so happen as here described; there is convincing argument that they could not have happened. See Appendix III.

2. **ἰθυμαχίῃ**. The word found here and c. 120 *infra*. The best commentary in Plutarch, *Sertor.* 10 *πρὸς μὲν εὐθυμαχίαν οὐδενὸς ἀτολμότερος τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἡγεμόνων ὅσα δὲ κλωπείας ἐν πολέμοις ἔργα καὶ πλεονεξίας περὶ τόπους ἐχυροὺς καὶ διαβάσεις τάχους δεομένας ἀπάτης τε καὶ ψευδῶν ἐν δέοντι σοφιστὴς δεινότατος.* To have attempted *ἰθυμαχίῃ*

πλησιοχώρους ἀγγέλους· τῶν δὲ καὶ δὴ οἱ βασιλέες συνελθόντες ἐβουλεύοντο ὡς στρατοῦ ἐπελαύνοντος μεγάλου. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ συνελθόντες βασιλέες Ταύρων καὶ Ἀγαθύρσων καὶ Νευρῶν καὶ Ἀνδροφάγων καὶ Μελαγχλαίνων καὶ Γελωνῶν καὶ Βουδίνων καὶ
Σαυροματέων. τούτων Ταῦροι μὲν νόμοισι τοιοισίδε χρέωνται· 103
θύουσι μὲν τῇ Παρθένῳ τούς τε ναυηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἂν λάβωσι Ἑλλήνων ἐπαναχθέντες τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· καταρξάμενοι ῥοπάλῳ παίουσι τὴν κεφαλήν. οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι ὡς τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημνοῦ ὠθέουσι κάτω (ἐπὶ γὰρ κρημνοῦ ἵδρυται τὸ ἱρόν), τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυροῦσι· οἱ δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁμολογέουσι, τὸ μέντοι σῶμα οὐκ ὠθέεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημνοῦ λέγουσι ἀλλὰ γῇ κρύπτεσθαι. τὴν δὲ δαίμονα ταύτην τῇ θύουσι λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Ταῦροι Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος εἶναι. πολεμίους δὲ ἄνδρας τοὺς ἂν χειρώσωνται ποιεῦσι τάδε· ἀποταμὼν [ἕκαστος]

---

would have been to abandon their own greatest invention, c. 46. Yet this council implies that they contemplate so doing, cp. c. 120 *infra*. Subsequently a remnant of the Scyths offer pitched battle, c. 134 *infra*.

τοὺς πλησιοχώρους. Tauri are in the south-east, c. 99 *supra*: the four tribes next named recur as usual in order from west to east, and form the north boundary of Scythia, c. 100 *supra*: the Geloni, Budini, and Sauromatae are east of Tanais, cc. 21, 22 *supra*. The Scyths are apparently excluded from this congress, which takes place at a time and place unspecified. The mention of it, however, affords the narrator opportunity for an anthropological excursus, which would hardly have been in its proper place here, if the geographical portions above cited (cc. 21 ff.) had formed originally an integral part of the Σκυθικοὶ λόγοι, or τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς ᾖα λέξων λόγον (c. 82 *supra*).

3. **καὶ δὴ** = ἤδη Stein, who compares 7. 196, 8. 94, 9. 6, etc.

103. 1. **Ταῦροι μέν.** Hdt.'s information about the Tauri is not to be regarded as the result of a personal visit to the country, nor is there anything that implies that he saw the coast, rather the reverse, cp. c. 99 *supra*. He indicates a conflict of hearsay authorities (οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι . . οἱ δέ), and the dubious assertion below made upon the authority of the Tauri themselves (λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Ταῦροι) is a good illustration of the fallacy of inferring from this formula that Hdt. is himself drawing directly and immediately from every fountain-head of tradition which he names. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxix.

The Tauri were wreckers and pirates who found a religious sanction for profitable but inhuman and unhellenic practices: worse in fact than the Thracians of Salmydessos described by Xen. *Anab.* 7. 5, 13 (c. 93 *supra*).

3. **Ἑλλήνων.** The only persons they would find on the high seas.

ἐπαναχθέντες, 'on the high seas.' The word has MS. authority, and is restored by Stein for the ἐπαναχθέντας mistranslated 'delatos illuc,' or the conjecture of Schweighäuser ἀπενειχθέντας, which would be rightly so rendered, but gives a sense very much inferior to the MS. reading. For ἐπανάγω see L. & S. *sub v.* IV. and correct V.

καταρξάμενοι. Cp. c. 60 *supra*.

9. **Ἰφιγένειαν.** This would be very small consolation to the Hellenic victims or their friends. On the probable antecedents of this Virgin, see note c. 87 *supra*. The cult was un-Hellenic and prae-Hellenic, going back to old Lemnos and the Lemnians, a trace perhaps of Phoenician influences in the Aegean and Pontos, though of course it is not improbable that the Semitic rituals found some native elements or cults with which to coalesce, just as in the case of Hellenic worships.

κεφαλὴν ἀποφέρεται ἐς τὰ οἰκία, ἔπειτα ἐπὶ ξύλου μεγάλου ἀναπείρας ἱστᾷ ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκίης ὑπερέχουσαν πολλόν, μάλιστα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς καπνοδόκης. φασὶ δὲ τούτους φυλάκους τῆς οἰκίης πάσης ὑπεραιωρέεσθαι. ζῶσι δὲ ἀπὸ ληίης τε καὶ πολέμου.
104 *Ἀγάθυρσοι δὲ ἁβρότατοι ἀνδρῶν εἰσι καὶ χρυσοφόροι τὰ μάλιστα, ἐπίκοινον δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν τὴν μῖξιν ποιεῦνται, ἵνα κασίγνητοί τε ἀλλήλων ἔωσι καὶ οἰκήιοι ἐόντες πάντες μήτε φθόνῳ μήτε ἔχθεϊ χρέωνται ἐς ἀλλήλους. τὰ δὲ ἄλλα νόμαια*
105 *Θρήιξι προσκεχωρήκασι. Νευροὶ δὲ νόμοισι μὲν χρέωνται*

---

11. **κεφαλήν.** On these head-trophies, cp. c. 64 *supra*, and H. Spencer, *Ceremonial Institutions*, § 350. The Tauri, be it observed, have houses, with chimneys or smoke-vents, according to Hdt.

14. **ὑπεραιωρέεσθαι**, 6. 116 *infra*.

104. 1. **Ἀγάθυρσοι.** A remarkable contrast to the Thracians just across the Danube (cp. c. 95 *supra*), whom they nearly approach in all other customs except those next specified!

Stein argues that *ἁβρός* here seems to apply only to externals, at least if it is to be reconciled with the spirited conduct of the Agathyrsi described in c. 125 *infra*. But this ingenious argument assumes that Hdt. is conscious and careful of such latent inconsistencies. Moreover the word was used in the poets, especially Pindar, without any condemnatory sense: nor in 1. 71 does Hdt. appear to use it in such a sense (*οὔτε ἁβρὸν οὔτε ἀγαθὸν οὐδέν*). Here perhaps he uses the word in a poetical way or even from a poetical source. On the gold cp. c. 5 *supra*. It is a suspicious circumstance that it should be so common with the Agathyrsi.

2. **ἐπίκοινον.** The extent and evidences of this promiscuity require definition before the anthropologist can make much of it: nay, it is doubtful, notwithstanding the frequency with which such conditions have been reported by outsiders, whether they ever or anywhere have existed. (Cp. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, cc. iv. v. vi., and cc. 172, 180 *infra*.)

3. **κασίγνητοι.** We have here an illustration of "the classificatory system of relationships." Cp. L. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity*, etc., Washington, 1871. A result of certain social arrangements very different from the patriarchal system seems here ascribed to moral and sentimental intentions, though the rationale of such things is to be sought rather in economic and social causes, than in the spiritual motives which led Plato to propose a reversion to Communism, in the Ideal State. We have here in fact another example of the ordinary Greek rationalism of the day, which resembled some modern rationalisms in explaining primitive man's action by motives or ideas, good and bad, drawn from the experiences of civilised society. In this case the motive is ideal. (In the story of Salmoxis above, the reverse.) This explanation was from an Hellenic Rousseau. It is unhistorical. (Cp. for a modern instance of the same sort note to 6. 65 *infra*.)

4. **φθόνος** is an eminently political or civil vice (cp. 7. 237 *πολιήτης μὲν πολιήτῃ εὖ πρήσσοντι φθονέει*), but the abolition of the family, or even of property, will hardly eradicate it, so long as society gives more honour, or God more ability, to one man than to another.

105. 1. **Νευροί.** The wizard Neuri separate the wealthy and well-intentioned Agathyrsi (c. 104) from the unjust and inhuman Androphagi (c. 106).

This story of an evacuation of the country before a plague of serpents looks as though it had some sort of historic fact behind it (cp. c. 173 *infra*). Hdt. must be understood to mean that the Neuri returned after the serpents disappeared, for the Neuri, not the serpents, are in possession at the time of Dareios and in the historian's own day. The comparative exactness of the date is remarkable. It might be conjectured that the story really records the advent of the Neuri to their historic district on the confines of Scythia, which is represented (by implication) as a return, and reoccupation of territory rightly their own: though

Σκυθικοῖσι, γενεῇ δὲ μιῇ πρότερόν σφεας τῆς Δαρείου στρατη-
λασίης κατέλαβε ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν χώρην πᾶσαν ὑπὸ ὀφίων· ὄφιας
γάρ σφι πολλοὺς μὲν ἡ χώρη ἀνέφαινε, οἱ δὲ πλεῦνες ἄνωθέν
σφι ἐκ τῶν ἐρήμων ἐπέπεσον, ἐς ὃ πιεζόμενοι οἴκησαν μετὰ
Βουδίνων τὴν ἑωυτῶν ἐκλιπόντες. κινδυνεύουσι δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι
οὗτοι γόητες εἶναι. λέγονται γὰρ ὑπὸ Σκυθέων καὶ Ἑλλήνων
τῶν ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ κατοικημένων ὡς ἔτεος ἑκάστου ἅπαξ τῶν
Νευρῶν ἕκαστος λύκος γίνεται ἡμέρας ὀλίγας καὶ αὖτις ὀπίσω
ἐς τὠυτὸ κατίσταται. ἐμὲ μέν νυν ταῦτα λέγοντες οὐ πείθουσι,
λέγουσι δὲ οὐδὲν ἧσσον, καὶ ὀμνῦσι δὲ λέγοντες. Ἀνδροφάγοι 106
δὲ ἀγριώτατα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἔχουσι ἤθεα, οὔτε δίκην νομί-
ζοντες οὔτε νόμῳ οὐδενὶ χρεώμενοι· νομάδες δέ εἰσι, ἐσθῆτά τε
φορέουσι τῇ Σκυθικῇ ὁμοίην, γλῶσσαν δὲ ἰδίην, ἀνδροφαγέουσι
δὲ μοῦνοι τούτων. Μελάγχλαινοι δὲ εἵματα μὲν μέλανα 107

---

it might be rash to say that the snakes represent the previous inhabitants (*αὐτόχθονες*) or their 'totems.'

4. **ἄνωθέν σφι ἐκ τῶν ἐρήμων.** Cp. c. 17 *supra* Νευρῶν δὲ τὸ πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον ἔρημον ἀνθρώπων ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.

6. **Βουδίνων.** Stein objects that the Budini were according to Hdt. (c. 21 *supra*) beyond the Tanais. What of that? The Budini were in any case the next people to the east of the Neuri of whom the Greeks had any real knowledge. See notes on Androphagi (c. 106) and Melanchlaeni (c. 107), names which are perhaps only descriptive epithets hypostatised and inserted between the Neuri and the Budini, to enrich the perspective.

7. **λέγονται.** The Scyths told the Hellenes living in Scythia, who told Herodotus? At least the swearing looks as though he had heard strong language. Did the Greeks swear that the Scythians told them? On the formula cp. Introduction, § 22. The belief in werewolves is wide-spread. Cp. Tylor's *Prim. Culture*, i. 113, 308 (Werewolves) and ii. 191 ff. (Vampires).

106. 1. **Ἀνδροφάγοι.** Androphagi had the Neuri to the W. and the Melanchlaeni to the E. of them: N. and S. of them two deserts, c. 18 *supra*. Here, their clothing is said to resemble the Scythian: in c. 18 *supra* they are described as ἔθνος ἴδιον καὶ οὐδαμῶς Σκυθικόν. We must not say in such cases that Hdt. contradicts himself: better say that Hdt. omits to reconcile the discrepancies in various accounts and narratives collected by him.

4. **γλῶσσαν** Stein explains with φορέουσι as a zeugma. Holder (following Reiske) inserts ἔχουσι, van Herwerden (following Dobree) λέγουσι after ἰδίην.

ἀνδροφαγέουσι. Holder reads, with β (= R + (V + S)), ἀνθρωποφαγέουσι. Whatever their title, it is not likely that these cannibals restricted their appetite to the one sex. (On Cannibalism, cp. Oscar Peschel, *Races of Man*, E. tr. pp. 161 ff. Peschel endeavours to establish three points: (1) that cannibalism is not a necessary stage in evolution, (2) that it is unconnected with the custom of human sacrifice, (3) that it is not peculiar to inferior races, but "is most frequently encountered exactly among those nations and groups of nations which are distinguished from their neighbours by their abilities and more mature social condition." Cp. c. 26 *supra*, 3. 99, 1. 216—all cases in which the cannibalism seems to have a religious significance. 3. 38 gives the philosophy of the question, *l'esprit des lois*, in the form of an anecdote.)

107. 1. **Μελάγχλαινοι.** ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ οὐ Σκυθικόν c. 20 *supra*. If the Scyths did not wear black (skin) coats, one or more of the tribes inland did so. Rawlinson suggests that the name may be a translation of the native name, citing parallel cases from India and America. It is certain that these *Blackcapes* have a long literary history from Hekataios, who calls them a Scythic tribe (*F.* 154,

φορέουσι πάντες, ἐπ᾽ ὧν καὶ τὰς ἐπωνυμίας ἔχουσι, νόμοισι δὲ
108 *Σκυθικοῖσι χρέωνται. Βουδῖνοι δὲ ἔθνος ἐὸν μέγα καὶ πολλὸν γλαυκόν τε πᾶν ἰσχυρῶς ἐστι καὶ πυρρόν. πόλις δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖσι πεπόλισται ξυλίνη, οὔνομα δὲ τῇ πόλι ἐστὶ Γελωνός· τοῦ δὲ τείχεος μέγαθος κῶλον ἕκαστον τριήκοντα σταδίων ἐστί, ὑψηλὸν δὲ καὶ πᾶν ξύλινον, καὶ αἱ οἰκίαι αὐτῶν ξύλιναι καὶ τὰ ἱρά. ἔστι γὰρ δὴ αὐτόθι Ἑλληνικῶν θεῶν ἱρὰ Ἑλληνικῶς κατεσκευασμένα ἀγάλμασί τε καὶ βωμοῖσι καὶ νηοῖσι ξυλίνοισι, καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ τριετηρίδας ἀνάγουσι καὶ βακχεύουσι. εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ*

Müller, i. 10) to Pliny (6. 5, 1) and a little later Dio Chrys. (p. 439) the latter of whom describes the black Himation and other clothing worn by the Borysthenites as borrowed *ἀπὸ γένους τινὸς Σκυθῶν τῶν Μελαγχλαίνων ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκοῦσι κατὰ τοῦτο ὀνομασθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων.*

2. **τὰς ἐπωνυμίας.** The plural here is embarrassing: the text is not above suspicion, for the words *ἀνδροφαγέουσι* or *ἀνθρωποφαγέουσι μοῦνοι τούτων* occur here in the MSS. after *ἔχουσι*, and were transferred to the previous chapter by Reiz (after Wesseling), whom the rest have followed.

108. 1. **Βουδῖνοι.** In c. 21 *supra* the Budini are placed E. of Tanais. Nothing is here said of the Tanais, but as in c. 100 *supra* the Melanchlaeni are *τελευταῖοι*, farthest east, of the tribes forming the north boundary of Scythia, the map-maker may be justified in representing the Tanais as the boundary between the Melanchlaeni and Budini-Geloni.

2. **γλαυκόν**, 'blue-eyed.' Cp. J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik*, i. p. 585.

πυρρός is darker than *ξανθός*, Plato *Tim.* 68 c, and generally refers to the hair. If Stein is right in taking it here of the *skin* on the strength of Hippokr. *de Aer.* 20 (cp. Neumann, p. 155), where certainly it is so used and applied to the whole Scythic race, then Hdt. is here guilty of making a distinction where none existed, the Budini in his conception plainly offering a physical contrast to the Scyths. But there is no need to divert the word from its usual application by reference to Hippokrates a junior contemporary of Hdt. whom it is not to be supposed that Hdt. is here quoting. Larcher takes the terms to refer to *painting* the body red and green: citing Verg. *Georg.* 2. 115 and Heyne's note. To see in these red-haired blue-eyed Budini "the ancestors of the German race," as Rawlinson does in one sentence, or "a remnant of the Cimmerians," as he does in the next sentence but one (vol. iii. p. 92, n.[3]): or in their city, the Asgard of the Scandinavian mythology, with Lenormant (*Manual*, ii. p. 134), or to identify them with Buddhists, as did apparently the great geographer C. Ritter, *Vorhalle*, p. 381, or indeed to adopt any one of the numerous hypotheses in respect to their ethnology, is to go beyond the evidence, which is too imperfect to lead to any determination. The article in Smith, *Dict. Geogr.* i. 455, is worth consulting.

πόλις . . Γελωνός. It is not for members of a modern 'nation of shopkeepers,' with experience of the zeal of commercial (and missionary) enterprise and settlements, to question the possibility of such an Hellenic colony or outpost as is here described. Still one cannot but feel that such a well-organised and permanent establishment as is implied in this description seems improbable, located, as it is, in the heart of savagery. It cannot be supposed that Hdt. speaks as an eye-witness, though he speaks with the assurance of one. Nor should the fact that the description is correct ecclesiastically, *ἀγάλματα, βωμοί, νηοί* being the three essential requisites for Hellenic temple-service (Stein), and the orgiastic Dionysos festivals being biennial, in any way mislead us into believing that Hdt. ever set eyes on the wooden walls of Gelonos. If such things were evidences there would be an end to all story-telling, and one might as well argue to the truth of the Amazonian adventure, c. 110 *infra*, from the nautical correctness of the terminology there, *πηδάλια, ἱστία, εἰρεσίη*.

8. **τριετηρίδας.** Diodor. Sic. 4. 3, Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* 3. 23, Ovid, *Fast.*

Γελωνοὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον Ἕλληνες, ἐκ τῶν δὲ ἐμπορίων ἐξαναστάντες οἴκησαν ἐν τοῖσι Βουδίνοισι· καὶ γλώσσῃ τὰ μὲν Σκυθικῇ τὰ δὲ Ἑλληνικῇ χρέωνται. Βουδῖνοι δὲ οὐ τῇ αὐτῇ γλώσσῃ χρέωνται καὶ Γελωνοί, οὐδὲ δίαιτα ἡ αὐτή. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Βουδῖνοι ἐόντες 109
αὐτόχθονες νομάδες τέ εἰσι καὶ φθειροτραγέουσι μοῦνοι τῶν ταύτῃ, Γελωνοὶ δὲ γῆς τε ἐργάται καὶ σιτοφάγοι καὶ κήπους ἐκτημένοι, οὐδὲν τὴν ἰδέην ὅμοιοι οὐδὲ τὸ χρῶμα. ὑπὸ μέντοι Ἑλλήνων καλέονται καὶ οἱ Βουδῖνοι Γελωνοί, οὐκ ὀρθῶς καλεόμενοι. ἡ δὲ χώρη σφέων πᾶσά ἐστι δασέα ἴδῃσι παντοίῃσι· ἐν δὲ τῇ ἴδῃ τῇ πλείστῃ ἐστὶ λίμνη μεγάλη τε καὶ πολλὴ καὶ ἕλος καὶ κάλαμος περὶ αὐτήν. ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ ἐνύδριες ἁλίσκονται καὶ κάστορες καὶ ἄλλα θηρία τετραγωνοπρόσωπα, τῶν τὰ δέρματα παρὰ τὰς σισύρνας παραρράπτεται, καὶ οἱ ὄρχιες αὐτοῖσί εἰσι χρήσιμοι ἐς ὑστερέων ἄκεσιν.

---

1. 393 f., Schömann, *Gr. Alt.* ii.[3] 501 f. Best of all, Ed. Greswell, *Origines Kal. Hell.* vol. v. pp. 4 ff.

9. **ἐξαναστάντες.** From Olbia, Tyras, etc. Stein, who wishes to find room for the Budini west of the Tanais, upon the Borysthenes, sees in this tradition a confirmation of his localisation. But even Hdt. can hardly have forgotten his own assertion in c. 21 *supra*, that the Budini lived east of the Tanais, beyond Scythia: and Neumann (*op. c.* p. 91) long ago pointed out that they form a link or station in the great trade-route that ran N. E. from the Pontos to the Ural regions.

109. 2. **φθειροτραγέουσι.** "Qui mangent de la vermine" Larcher; "they eat lice" Rawlinson. C. Ritter (*Vorhalle*, etc. Berlin 1820, p. 154) was the first to suggest that φθεῖρες here meant 'fir-cones,' and he is followed by Stein, who cites Strabo and Arrian for the existence of a tribe on Caucasus named φθειροφάγοι near a town named Πιτνοῦς, and adds Phot. lex. φθείρ, ὁ τῆς πίτυος κάρπος. The real or at least the first question must be: What did Hdt. understand by the word? The practice ascribed c. 168 *infra* to the women of the Adyrmachidae, cp. note *ad l.*, in the absence of any clearer indication of his meaning, may be taken as a fair commentary on the word here. If it be said that the κάρπος πίτυος was edible, it may be replied that so is the φθείρ, nor is it quite obvious why φθείρ, vegetable, is a better antithesis to σῖτος than φθείρ, animal. Finally, vermin-eating is a not uncommon practice (Oscar Peschel, *Races*, p. 159).

4. **τὸ χρῶμα.** We cannot argue from this that πυῤῥὸς in c. 108 must refer to the colour of the skin, for the contrast is not fully drawn out—γλαυκὸς there and ἰδέη here being left unrelated.

ὑπὸ . . καλεόμενοι. 'There are Greeks who make the mistake of calling the Budini Geloni'—perhaps Hekataios?

8. **ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ.** On this passage Stein quotes Neumann pp. 92 f. as showing that on the upper courses of the Don otters and beavers and elk (*Elend*), not to say wolves and bears, were found as late as 1380. If any stress were to be laid on the locality the fauna would make against his transfer of the Budini to the Borysthenes. But no doubt these animals were formerly spread over a wide area, and this passage affords in reality a poor argument for the identification of Gelonus, and its site, either way.

9. **τετραγωνοπρόσωπα.** Neumann and Stein think, points to a distorted description of the elk: Rawlinson hints at 'seals.' Is it anything more than a judicious *et caetera*? Cp. for such a saving clause c. 191 *infra*.

10. **σισύρνας.** See L. & S. *sub v.* and σισύρα.

ὄρχιες. The καστόριον is probably meant, an item in the Hellenic pharmacopoeia not to be confounded with the vegetable product, castor oil, and erroneously supposed to have the utility here ascribed to it.

110 Σαυροματέων δὲ πέρι ὧδε λέγεται. ὅτε Ἕλληνες Ἀμαζόσι ἐμαχέσαντο (τὰς δὲ Ἀμαζόνας καλέουσι Σκύθαι Οἰόρπατα, δύναται δὲ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἀνδροκτόνοι· οἰὸρ γὰρ καλέουσι ἄνδρα, τὸ δὲ πατὰ κτείνειν), τότε λόγος τοὺς Ἕλληνας νικήσαντας τῇ ἐπὶ Θερμώδοντι μάχῃ ἀποπλέειν ἄγοντας τρισὶ πλοίοισι τῶν Ἀμαζόνων ὅσας ἐδυνέατο ζωγρῆσαι, τὰς δ' ἐν τῷ πελάγεϊ ἐπιθεμένας ἐκκόψαι τοὺς ἄνδρας. πλοῖα δὲ οὐ γινώσκειν αὐτὰς οὐδὲ πηδαλίοισι χρᾶσθαι οὐδὲ ἱστίοισι οὐδὲ εἰρεσίῃ· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐξέκοψαν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐφέροντο κατὰ κῦμα καὶ ἄνεμον, καὶ ἀπικνέονται τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαιήτιδος ἐπὶ Κρημνούς· οἱ δὲ Κρημνοὶ εἰσὶ γῆς τῆς Σκυθέων τῶν ἐλευθέρων. ἐνθαῦτα ἀποβᾶσαι ἀπὸ τῶν πλοίων αἱ Ἀμαζόνες ὁδοιπόρεον ἐς τὴν οἰκεομένην. ἐντυχοῦσαι δὲ πρώτῳ ἱπποφορβίῳ τοῦτο διήρπασαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων ἱππαζόμεναι ἐληίζοντο τὰ τῶν Σκυθέων.

111 οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι οὐκ εἶχον συμβαλέσθαι τὸ πρῆγμα· οὔτε γὰρ φωνὴν οὔτε ἐσθῆτα οὔτε τὸ ἔθνος ἐγίνωσκον, ἀλλ' ἐν θώματι ἦσαν ὁκόθεν ἔλθοιεν, ἐδόκεον δ' αὐτὰς εἶναι ἄνδρας τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίην ἔχοντας, μάχην τε δὴ πρὸς αὐτὰς ἐποιεῦντο. ἐκ δὲ τῆς μάχης τῶν νεκρῶν ἐκράτησαν οἱ Σκύθαι, καὶ οὕτω ἔγνωσαν ἐούσας γυναῖκας. βουλευομένοισι ὦν αὐτοῖσι ἔδοξε κτείνειν μὲν

---

110. 1. Σαυροματέων. The Sauromatae were south of the Budini, east of the Palus Maeotis, or rather of the Tanais, *vide* cc. 21 *supra*, 116 *infra*. That the two statements are not quite consistent, is only a fresh illustration of the fact that Hdt. draws on varying sources without always harmonising them. It might appear that "a custom of the women," in which they differed widely from the Scyths, whom yet they in many respects resembled, suggested to the Greeks this entertaining fable of their origin, which Hdt. here inserts according to his wont, quite oblivious of the inconsistency in which he hereby is involved. For according to this story the Scyths are in possession of Scythia in the time of the Amazons, and of Herakles; whereas, according to the view to which Hdt. has previously committed himself, the Scyths had immigrated into Scythia in comparatively recent times, c. 11 *supra* (Neumann, p. 327).

λέγεται. By whom? C. Fries, *Quaestiones Herodoteae*, Berlin 1893, argues that Herodotus is combating a story which Hekataios had drawn from a poetical source, with a version which he himself had *heard* from 'Pontine Greeks.'

2. **Οἰόρπατα.** On the Scythian tongue cp. Appendix I.

3. **Ἑλλάδα.** Ἑλλὰς is an adjective, cp. c. 78 *supra*.

5. **ἐπὶ Θερμώδοντι.** The battle on the Thermodon took place between Theseus-Herakles and Antiope-Hippolyte, and their respective followings. Cp. 9. 27.

6. **ὅσας.** The remainder lived to fight another day, 9. 27. On the Amazonian *Sagas* cp. Roscher, *Lexikon*, 267 ff.

11. **Κρημνούς.** Having passed the Thracian Bosporos under cover of night? The Thermodon, Bosporos and Kremni are on the same meridian, all but: 36 E. Greenwich. Hdt. seems to forget that he has located Kremni c. 20 *supra*. The 'free' Scythians there appear as τοὺς ἄλλους νομίζοντες Σκύθας δούλους σφετέρους εἶναι.

111. 1. συμβαλέσθαι. See L. & S. *sub v.* III. C. (p. 1457), and on the significance of the terminology in this passage cp. Introduction, p. lxxx.

οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ ἔτι αὐτάς, ἑωυτῶν δὲ τοὺς νεωτάτους ἀποπέμψαι ἐς αὐτάς, πλῆθος εἰκάσαντας ὅσαι περ ἐκεῖναι ἦσαν, τούτους δὲ στρατοπεδεύεσθαι πλησίον ἐκεινέων καὶ ποιέειν τά περ ἂν καὶ ἐκεῖναι ποιέωσι· ἢν δὲ αὐτοὺς διώκωσι, μάχεσθαι μὲν μή, ὑποφεύγειν δέ· ἐπεὰν δὲ παύσωνται, ἐλθόντας αὖτις πλησίον στρατοπεδεύεσθαι. ταῦτα ἐβουλεύσαντο οἱ Σκύθαι βουλόμενοι ἐξ αὐτέων παῖδας ἐκγενήσεσθαι. ἀποπεμφθέντες δὲ οἱ νεηνίσκοι
ἐποίευν τὰ ἐντεταλμένα. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔμαθον αὐτοὺς αἱ Ἀμαζόνες 112
ἐπ' οὐδεμιῇ δηλήσι ἀπιγμένους, ἔων χαίρειν· προσεχώρεον δὲ πλησιαιτέρω τὸ στρατόπεδον τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἐπ' ἡμέρῃ ἑκάστῃ. εἶχον δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδ' οἱ νεηνίσκοι, ὥσπερ αἱ Ἀμαζόνες, εἰ μὴ τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τοὺς ἵππους, ἀλλὰ ζόην ἔζωον τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνῃσι,
θηρεύοντές τε καὶ ληιζόμενοι. ἐποίευν δὲ αἱ Ἀμαζόνες ἐς τὴν 113
μεσαμβρίην τοιόνδε· ἐγίνοντο σποράδες κατὰ μίαν τε καὶ δύο, πρόσω δὴ ἀπ' ἀλληλέων ἐς εὐμαρείην ἀποσκιδνάμεναι. μαθόντες δὲ καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι ἐποίευν τὠυτὸ τοῦτο. καί τις μουνωθεισέων τινὶ αὐτέων ἐνεχρίμπτετο, καὶ ἡ Ἀμαζὼν οὐκ ἀπωθέετο ἀλλὰ περιεῖδε χρήσασθαι. καὶ φωνῆσαι μὲν οὐκ εἶχε, οὐ γὰρ συνίεσαν ἀλλήλων, τῇ δὲ χειρὶ ἔφραζε ἐς τὴν ὑστεραίην ἐλθεῖν ἐς τὠυτὸ χωρίον καὶ ἕτερον ἄγειν, σημαίνουσα δύο γενέσθαι, καὶ αὐτὴ ἑτέρην ἄξειν. ὁ δὲ νεηνίσκος, ἐπεὶ ἀπῆλθε, ἔλεξε ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς λοιπούς· τῇ δὲ δευτεραίῃ ἦλθε ἐς τὸ χωρίον αὐτός τε οὗτος καὶ ἕτερον ἦγε, καὶ τὴν Ἀμαζόνα εὗρε δευτέρην αὐτὴν ὑπομένουσαν. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ νεηνίσκοι ὡς ἐπύθοντο ταῦτα, καὶ
αὐτοὶ ἐκτιλώσαντο τὰς λοιπὰς τῶν Ἀμαζόνων. μετὰ δὲ συμμί- 114
ξαντες τὰ στρατόπεδα οἴκεον ὁμοῦ, γυναῖκα ἔχων ἕκαστος ταύτην

---

7. **ἑωυτῶν**, 'warriors.'

8. **πλῆθος**. Three boat-loads of prisoners, some of whom had since been slain, would not have amounted to very many; say 150? Anyway the Scyths were pretty far advanced in the art of counting. (Cp. Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, c. vii., *Anthropology*, c. xiii.)

112. 2. **προσεχώρεον**. A striking instance of a construction not uncommon in Hdt., *e.g.* 5. 112 ὡς συνῆλθε τὰ στρατόπεδα συμπεσόντα ἐμάχοντο.

5. **ζόην ἔζωον**. Cp. ἔργα . . ἐργάζονται, c. 114 *infra*.

113. 6. **φωνῆσαι**. Cp. φωνή, c. 114 *infra*. One cannot expect Hdt. to be as exact as Aristotle, *Pol.* 1. 2, 11, 1253a ἡ μὲν οὖν φωνὴ τοῦ λυπηροῦ καὶ ἡδέος ἐστὶ σημεῖον, διὸ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπάρχει ζῴοις. φωνὴ and λόγος are not always distinct to Hdt. (cp. c. 114 *infra*) though he elsewhere uses γλῶσσα for speech, and φωνὴ for donkeys' braying, c. 129 *infra*. Cp. further the use of λόγος c. 127 *infra*. There follows a fine illustration of gesture language. (On which in general cp. Tylor, *Early History of Mankind*, cc. ii. iii. iv., and on this passage and 7. 233, Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Gr. u. Rom.* p. 148[6].)

13. **ἐκτιλώσαντο**. Pindar uses the form κτιλεύειν *mansuefacere*. ἔνθα οἱ ποῖμναι κτιλεύονται κάπρων λεόντων τε *Fr.* 238, and the adj. κτίλος, ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας *Pyth.* 2. 17, on which the Schol. οἱονεὶ τὸν συντεθραμμένον καὶ συνήθη λέγει καὶ εἰθισμένον τῇ χειρί.

114. 2. **ἕκαστος ταύτην**. It seems going far to infer from this phrase a strict monogamy among the historic

τῇ τὸ πρῶτον συνεμίχθη. τὴν δὲ φωνὴν τὴν μὲν τῶν γυναικῶν οἱ ἄνδρες οὐκ ἐδυνέατο μαθεῖν, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αἱ γυναῖκες συνέλαβον. ἐπεὶ δὲ συνῆκαν ἀλλήλων, ἔλεξαν πρὸς τὰς Ἀμαζόνας τάδε οἱ ἄνδρες. "ἡμῖν εἰσὶ μὲν τοκέες, εἰσὶ δὲ κτήσιες· νῦν ὦν μηκέτι πλεῦνα χρόνον ζόην τοιήνδε ἔχωμεν, ἀλλ' ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὸ πλῆθος διαιτώμεθα. γυναῖκας δὲ ἕξομεν ὑμέας καὶ οὐδαμὰς ἄλλας." αἱ δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ἔλεξαν τάδε. "ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἂν δυναίμεθα οἰκέειν μετὰ τῶν ὑμετερέων γυναικῶν· οὐ γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ νόμαια ἡμῖν τε κἀκείνῃσί ἐστι. ἡμεῖς μὲν τοξεύομέν τε καὶ ἀκοντίζομεν καὶ ἱππαζόμεθα, ἔργα δὲ γυναικήια οὐκ ἐμάθομεν· αἱ δὲ ὑμέτεραι γυναῖκες τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν ἡμεῖς κατελέξαμεν ποιεῦσι, ἔργα δὲ γυναικήια ἐργάζονται μένουσαι ἐν τῇσι ἁμάξῃσι, οὔτ' ἐπὶ θήρην ἰοῦσαι οὔτε ἄλλῃ οὐδαμῇ. οὐκ ἂν ὦν δυναίμεθα ἐκείνῃσι συμφέρεσθαι. ἀλλ' εἰ βούλεσθε γυναῖκας ἔχειν ἡμέας καὶ δοκέειν εἶναι δίκαιοι, ἐλθόντες παρὰ τοὺς τοκέας ἀπολάχετε τῶν κτημάτων τὸ μέρος,

115 καὶ ἔπειτα ἐλθόντες οἰκέωμεν ἐπὶ ἡμέων αὐτῶν." ἐπείθοντο καὶ ἐποίησαν ταῦτα οἱ νεηνίσκοι. ἐπείτε δὲ ἀπολαχόντες τῶν κτημάτων τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἦλθον ὀπίσω παρὰ τὰς Ἀμαζόνας, ἔλεξαν αἱ γυναῖκες πρὸς αὐτοὺς τάδε. "ἡμέας ἔχει φόβος τε καὶ δέος ὅκως χρὴ οἰκέειν ἐν τῷδε τῷ χώρῳ, τοῦτο μὲν ὑμέας ἀποστερησάσας πατέρων, τοῦτο δὲ γῆν τὴν ὑμετέρην δηλησαμένας πολλά. ἀλλ' ἐπείτε ἀξιοῦτε ἡμέας γυναῖκας ἔχειν, τάδε ποιέετε ἅμα ἡμῖν· φέρετε ἐξαναστέωμεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς τῆσδε καὶ

116 περήσαντες Τάναϊν ποταμὸν οἰκέωμεν." ἐπείθοντο καὶ ταῦτα οἱ νεηνίσκοι, διαβάντες δὲ τὸν Τάναϊν ὁδοιπόρεον πρὸς ἥλιον

Sauromatae: but the historic fact of a primitive pairing season *inter alia* may fairly be read in this legend. A charming story has been told by Addison, *Spectator*, No. 433, in which he more than hints at the said 'pairing season,' of which Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, c. ii., has made a good deal: in justice to Ed. Greswell, it should be observed that he long ago collected a vast amount of evidence on the matter, see *Origines Kal. Hell.* vi. 571 ff.

3. **φωνήν.** One might have expected γλῶσσαν, cp. c. 108 *supra*, but cp. Pindar's φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν and φωνῆσαι cc. 112 *supra*, 117 *infra*.

4. **οἱ ἄνδρες.** With their characteristic stupidity, c. 46 *supra*.

116. 2. **τὸν Τάναϊν.** The geographical position of the Sauromatae at the date of the story is here very exactly indicated; yet it is not quite plain whether we are to conceive them as three days' or as six days' journey beyond the Tanais, which appears, in either case, as the eastern boundary of Scythia. Probably the former. In c. 21 *supra* the territory of the Sauromatae begins immediately beyond the Tanais, and extends fifteen days [3000 st., 375 *mill. pass.*] north from the Palus.

Hippokrates who agrees with Hdt. in the description of the manners and customs of these ladies limits their martial performances (cp. Plato, *Rep.* 452 ff.) ἕως ἂν παρθένοι ἔωσι, Hippokr. *de Aer.* 17, and the limitation might be inferred from the next chapter, though Hdt. does not clearly express it. Hansen,

ἀνίσχοντα τριῶν μὲν ἡμερέων ἀπὸ τοῦ Τανάιδος ὁδόν, τριῶν δὲ
ἀπὸ τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαιήτιδος πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον. ἀπικόμενοι
δὲ ἐς τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον ἐν τῷ νῦν κατοίκηνται, οἴκησαν τοῦτον.
καὶ διαίτῃ ἀπὸ τούτου χρέωνται τῇ παλαιῇ τῶν Σαυροματέων
αἱ γυναῖκες, καὶ ἐπὶ θήρην ἐπ' ἵππων ἐκφοιτῶσαι ἅμα τοῖσι
ἀνδράσι καὶ χωρὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ ἐς πόλεμον φοιτῶσαι καὶ
στολὴν τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖσι ἀνδράσι φορέουσαι. φωνῇ δὲ οἱ Σαυρο- 117
μάται νομίζουσι Σκυθικῇ, σολοικίζοντες αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου,
ἐπεὶ οὐ χρηστῶς ἐξέμαθον αὐτὴν αἱ Ἀμαζόνες. τὰ περὶ
γάμων δὲ ὧδέ σφι διακέεται· οὐ γαμέεται παρθένος οὐδεμία
πρὶν ἂν τῶν πολεμίων ἄνδρα ἀποκτείνῃ· αἱ δέ τινες αὐτέων
καὶ τελευτῶσι γηραιαὶ πρὶν γήμασθαι, οὐ δυνάμεναι τὸν νόμον
ἐκπλῆσαι.

Ἐπὶ τούτων ὧν τῶν καταλεχθέντων ἐθνέων τοὺς βασιλέας 118
ἁλισμένους ἀπικόμενοι τῶν Σκυθέων οἱ ἄγγελοι ἔλεγον ἐκδιδάσκοντες ὡς ὁ Πέρσης, ἐπειδή οἱ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ τῇ ἑτέρῃ πάντα κατέστραπται, γέφυραν ζεύξας ἐπὶ τῷ αὐχένι τοῦ Βοσπόρου διαβέβηκε ἐς τήνδε τὴν ἤπειρον, διαβὰς δὲ καὶ καταστρεψάμενος Θρήικας γεφυροῖ ποταμὸν Ἴστρον, βουλόμενος καὶ τάδε πάντα ὑπ' ἑωυτῷ ποιήσασθαι. "ὑμεῖς ὦν μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι περιίδητε ἡμέας διαφθαρέντας, ἀλλὰ τὠυτὸ νοήσαντες

Ost-Europa, § 293, suggests that Σαυροματέων is a *lapsus calami* for Ἀμαζόνων. The same result would be achieved by taking τῶν Σ. αἱ γυναῖκες together.

117. 1. **φωνῇ.** Cp. c. 114 *supra*.

Σαυρομάται, Sauromedes. Northern Medes = Sauromatae = Sarmatae = Slaves, Rawlinson n.[6] to c. 117. If this were so, in the conquest of S. Russia, and the Danubian region, these 'Medes,' centuries after, fulfilled the intentions with which Dareios, according to Hdt., set out, viz. to punish the Scyths for their invasion of Media, c. 1 *supra*. On the Sarmatae see Smith's *Dict. Geogr. sub v.*, and Forbiger, in Pauly, *Real-Encyclop. sub v.*, Pape's *Wörterbuch d. gr. Eigenn.* 1347, 1354, Müllenhoff, *Deutsch. Alt.* iii. 101 ff., and Appendix I. *infra*.

118. 1. **ὧν.** Narrative resumed from c. 102 *supra*. With some very trifling verbal changes the speech which follows would have done admirably in the mouth of an Athenian addressing the congress at the Isthmos, before the invasion of Xerxes. It is difficult to suppose that the parallel was not latent in the historian's mind, or in his sources: it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the later situation has coloured the narrative of the earlier and remoter campaign. (A similar situation upon a smaller scale is sketched in the Corinthian speech, Thuc. 1. 120.) It must be admitted that the Scythian envoys very skilfully refute the view put forward by Hdt. in c. 1 *supra*. The harmonist may, however, say that the one passage gives the respectable, the other the real, reason: thus both are admissible! The Scythian view is rejected in favour of the Herodotean by a majority of the council, c. 119. Such likewise to a certain extent was the practical maxim of the Peloponnesians in 480 B.C. In fact why the Scythians should appear in the guise of petitioners before this congress of kings it would be hard to say, unless it be because their case is analogous to the Athenian attitude towards the Peloponnesians at a period, subsequent indeed to the date of the events here narrated, but prior to the date at which this narrative came into being. Cp. Introduction, § 17.

ἀντιάζωμεν τὸν ἐπιόντα. οὔκων ποιήσετε ταῦτα· ἡμεῖς μὲν πιεζόμενοι ἢ ἐκλείψομεν τὴν χώρην ἢ μένοντες ὁμολογίῃ χρησόμεθα. τί γὰρ πάθωμεν μὴ βουλομένων ὑμέων τιμωρέειν; ὑμῖν δὲ οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔσται ἐλαφρότερον· ἥκει γὰρ ὁ Πέρσης οὐδέν τι μᾶλλον ἐπ' ἡμέας ἢ οὐ καὶ ἐπ' ὑμέας, οὐδέ οἱ καταχρήσει ἡμέας καταστρεψαμένῳ ὑμέων ἀπέχεσθαι. μέγα δὲ ὑμῖν λόγων τῶνδε μαρτύριον ἐρέομεν. εἰ γὰρ ἐπ' ἡμέας μούνους ἐστρατηλάτεε ὁ Πέρσης τίσασθαι τῆς πρόσθε δουλοσύνης βουλόμενος, χρῆν αὐτὸν πάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενον ἰέναι οὕτω ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμετέρην, καὶ ἂν ἐδήλου πᾶσι ὡς ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἐλαύνει καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους. νῦν δὲ ἐπείτε τάχιστα διέβη ἐς τήνδε τὴν ἤπειρον, τοὺς αἰεὶ ἐμποδὼν γινομένους ἡμεροῦται πάντας· τούς τε δὴ ἄλλους ἔχει ὑπ' ἑωυτῷ Θρήικας καὶ δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἡμῖν
119 ἐόντας πλησιοχώρους Γέτας." ταῦτα Σκυθέων ἐπαγγελλομένων ἐβουλεύοντο οἱ βασιλέες οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνέων ἥκοντες, καί σφεων ἐσχίσθησαν αἱ γνῶμαι· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Γελωνὸς καὶ ὁ Βουδῖνος καὶ ὁ Σαυρομάτης κατὰ τὠυτὸ γενόμενοι ὑπεδέκοντο Σκύθῃσι τιμωρήσειν, ὁ δὲ Ἀγάθυρσος καὶ Νευρὸς καὶ Ἀνδροφάγος καὶ οἱ τῶν Μελαγχλαίνων καὶ Ταύρων τάδε Σκύθῃσι ὑπεκρίναντο. "εἰ μὲν μὴ ὑμεῖς ἔατε οἱ πρότεροι ἀδικήσαντες Πέρσας καὶ ἄρξαντες πολέμου, τούτων δεόμενοι τῶν νῦν δέεσθε λέγειν τε ἂν ἐφαίνεσθε ἡμῖν ὀρθά, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑπακούσαντες τὠυτὸ ἂν ὑμῖν ἐπρήσσομεν. νῦν δὲ ὑμεῖς τε ἐς τὴν ἐκείνων ἐσβαλόντες γῆν ἄνευ ἡμέων ἐπεκρατέετε Περσέων ὅσον χρόνον ὑμῖν ὁ θεὸς παρεδίδου, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι, ἐπεί σφεας ὡυτὸς θεὸς ἐγείρει, τὴν ὁμοίην ὑμῖν ἀποδιδοῦσι. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὔτε τι τότε ἠδικήσαμεν τοὺς ἄνδρας τούτους οὐδὲν οὔτε νῦν πρότεροι πειρησόμεθα ἀδικέειν. ἢν μέντοι ἐπίῃ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμετέρην ἄρξῃ τε ἀδικέων, καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐ πεισόμεθα, μέχρι δὲ τοῦτο ἴδωμεν, μενέομεν παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖσι· ἥκειν γὰρ δοκέομεν οὐκ ἐπ' ἡμέας Πέρσας ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοὺς αἰτίους τῆς ἀδικίης γενομένους."

120 Ταῦτα ὡς ἀπενειχθέντα ἐπύθοντο οἱ Σκύθαι, ἐβουλεύοντο ἰθυμαχίην μὲν μηδεμίαν ποιέεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανέος, ὅτε δή σφι

---

119. 3. **αἱ γνῶμαι.** The division of opinion is geographical, though the Tauric king, as an isolated factor, might have sided with either party. But had he joined the trans-Tanaites there would have been an even vote! That would have been awkward for the story.

16. **οὐ πεισόμεθα.** S. has *οὐκ οἰσόμεθα*: various other emendations have been suggested, particularly *οὐ περιοψόμεθα*, and *οἱ ἐπεισόμεθα*, epic for *ἔπιμεν* or *ἐπελευσόμεθα*. To this last Stein (1877) gives the preference, on the ground of other epicisms or archaisms in Hdt. *οὐ κεισόμεθα* is the reading of Stein's *editio minor*. Gompertz (*Stud. Herod.* ii. 64) defends, and van Herwerden approves, the vulgate.

120. 2. **ἰθυμαχίην**, c. 102 *supra*. **ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανέος** is superfluous.

οὗτοί γε σύμμαχοι οὐ προσεγίνοντο, ὑπεξιόντες δὲ καὶ ὑπεξελαύνοντες τὰ φρέατα τὰ παρεξίοιεν αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰς κρήνας συγχοῦν, τὴν ποίην τε ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκτρίβειν, διχοῦ σφέας διελόντες. καὶ πρὸς μὲν τὴν μίαν τῶν μοιρέων, τῆς ἐβασίλευε Σκώπασις, προσχωρέειν Σαυρομάτας· τούτους μὲν δὴ ὑπάγειν, ἢν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τράπηται ὁ Πέρσης, ἰθὺ Τανάιδος ποταμοῦ παρὰ τὴν Μαιῆτιν λίμνην ὑποφεύγοντας, ἀπελαύνοντός τε τοῦ Πέρσεω ἐπιόντας διώκειν. αὕτη μέν σφι μία ἦν μοῖρα τῆς βασιληίης, τεταγμένη ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἥ περ εἴρηται· τὰς δὲ δύο τῶν βασιληίων, τήν τε μεγάλην τῆς ἦρχε Ἰδάνθυρσος καὶ τὴν τρίτην τῆς ἐβασίλευε Τάξακις, συνελθούσας ἐς τὠυτὸ καὶ Γελωνῶν τε καὶ Βουδίνων προσγενομένων, ἡμέρης καὶ τούτους ὁδῷ προέχοντας τῶν Περσέων ὑπεξάγειν, ὑπιόντας τε καὶ ποιεῦντας τὰ βεβουλευμένα. πρῶτα μέν νυν ὑπάγειν σφέας ἰθὺ τῶν χωρέων τῶν ἀπειπαμένων τὴν σφετέρην συμμαχίην, ἵνα καὶ τούτους ἐκπολεμώσωσι· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἑκόντες γε ὑπέδυσαν τὸν πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς Πέρσας, ἀλλ' ἀέκοντας ἐκπολεμώσειν· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ὑποστρέφειν ἐς τὴν σφετέρην καὶ ἐπιχειρέειν, ἢν δὴ βουλευομένοισι δοκέῃ.

121 Ταῦτα οἱ Σκύθαι βουλευσάμενοι ὑπηντίαζον τὴν Δαρείου στρατιήν, προδρόμους ἀποστείλαντες τῶν ἱππέων τοὺς ἀρίστους. τὰς

---

4. **τὰ φρέατα . . καὶ τὰς κρήνας.** Leaving all the rivers however (cc. 47-57 *supra*) for the benefit of the Persian. This plan of campaign is rather calculated for Greece, where there were no rivers to speak of, than for Scythia: at least it could hardly have been devised by any one acquainted with Scythia, though it is consistent with the bare map of Scythia, sketched above, cc. 99-101.

5. **τὴν ποίην.** Cp. c. 58 *supra*. But what of all the products enumerated c. 17 *supra*?

6. **ἐβασίλευε** as a permanency: cp. c. 128 *infra*. There were three territorial divisions in *ἡ βασιλιηίη*, each under its own king, the greatest under Idanthyrsos, who has a sort of superiority over the others: the next probably that under Skopasis: the third under Taxakis, cp. c. 6 *supra*. The liegemen of Skopasis together with the Sauromatae, c. 116, are apparently thought of as almost equal to the following of Idanthyrsos reinforced by the contingent of Taxakis, and the Budini + Geloni.

7. **Σαυρομάτας** ought to include men and maidens, cc. 116, 117 *supra*, but the story of the campaign takes no account of women combatants: this is a great opportunity lost, and a fresh evidence that the legend of the Sauromatae above is an insertion from a different source, and no part of the original narrative of the campaign.

16. **ἰθὺ τῶν χωρέων.** Cp. c. 89 *supra* *ἰθὺ τοῦ Ἴστρου* and *ἰθὺ Τανάιδος*, l. 8 above.

τῶν ἀπειπαμένων, sc. *τῶν ἐθνέων*. This would take them either to the land of the Agathyrsi N.W. of Scythia, or to the land of the Tauri, S.E., two very different directions. The former seems intended; but in the sequel this is the last thing they attempt. In fact, as Rawlinson points out (vol. iii. p. 100) "the Sauromatae, Budini and Geloni are even the *first* sufferers. (*Infra* chs. 122, 123.)" This only shows how inconsequent the narrative is. To explain such inconsequence is not easy. Dareios had to be taken all over Scythia: on the other hand good Hellenic strategy might have commended the plan here indicated, for application to 'Medizers.'

δὲ ἁμάξας ἐν τῇσί σφι διαιτᾶτο τὰ τέκνα καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες πάσας καὶ τὰ πρόβατα πάντα, πλὴν ὅσα σφι ἐς φορβὴν ἱκανὰ ἦν τοσαῦτα ὑπολιπόμενοι, τὰ ἄλλα ἅμα τῇσι ἁμάξῃσι προέπεμψαν, ἐντει-
122 *λάμενοι αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς βορέω ἐλαύνειν. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ προεκομίζετο· τῶν δὲ Σκυθέων οἱ πρόδρομοι ὡς εὗρον τοὺς Πέρσας ὅσον τε τριῶν ἡμερέων ὁδὸν ἀπέχοντας ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἴστρου, οὗτοι μὲν τούτους εὑρόντες, ἡμέρης ὁδῷ προέχοντες, ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυόμενα λεαίνοντες. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὡς εἶδον ἐπιφανεῖσαν τῶν Σκυθέων τὴν ἵππον, ἐπήισαν κατὰ στίβον αἰεὶ ὑπαγόντων· καὶ ἔπειτα (πρὸς γὰρ τὴν μίαν τῶν μοιρέων ἴθυσαν) οἱ Πέρσαι ἐδίωκον πρὸς ἠῶ τε καὶ ἰθὺ Ταναΐδος· διαβάντων δὲ τούτων τὸν Τάναϊν ποταμὸν οἱ Πέρσαι ἐπιδιαβάντες ἐδίωκον, ἐς ὃ τῶν Σαυροματέων τὴν χώρην διεξελθόντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὴν τῶν*

---

121. 3. ἁμάξας. Cp. c. 114 *supra*, and especially c. 46 *supra*.

διαιτᾶτο. One might have expected the plural verb: but the more important word carries the construction. Slaves are not here specified at all. Cp. 8, 40 and 41.

4. **πλὴν ὅσα.** This looks like a bit of rationalism: all sent away except what they wanted for food; as if they knew just how many that would be: yet afterwards they have enough and to spare. Cp. c. 130 *infra*. But perhaps they were not sent very far! The gen. with *πρὸς* is noticeable. Some twenty days or less would have taken them out of Scythia, c. 101 *supra*. Were they not to go right away north, but to keep moving along the north line, inside their own frontier, or perhaps on the edge of the deserts? This grammatical refinement is difficult to maintain in the light of the recurrent phrase, c. 125 *infra* *αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς βορέω ἐλαύνειν*, "immer in nördlicher Richtung zu ziehen" Baehr; "to keep marching, without change of course, to the north" Rawlinson; "proceed continually towards the north wind" Macaulay. Such direction would have landed them in deserts, or in the lands *τῶν ἀπειπαμένων τὴν συμμαχίαν*, through which the Persians were to be led. Obviously there is here an inconsequence in the story, or between the story and the geography.

122. 2. τριῶν ἡμερέων. These three days would have taken the Persians on to the steppe between the Danube and the Dniestr, into Bessarabia. To this region, as Stein here points out, Strabo, 305, confines the trans-Danubian adventures of Dareios: misled, we may add, by an excessive rationalism. Nor is it easy, while admitting fully the contradictions and improbabilities of the Herodotean narrative, to describe it with Stein as a fabulous creation of *Scythian* vanity (*Ruhmredigkeit*). Greeks had more to say to this fable than Scyths, to judge by the internal evidences, and even perhaps the general probabilities.

3. **οὗτοι**, *sc. οἱ Σκύθαι.*

7. **μίαν.** The one under Skopasis, which included the Sauromatae.

8. **πρὸς ἠῶ τε καὶ τοῦ T.** is MSS. reading. One preposition with two different cases is rather startling. Stein therefore suggests that Hdt. wrote *ἰθὺ Ταναΐδος*, cp. c. 120 *supra*. May it not be that there is a combination of an absolute direction (*πρὸς ἠῶ*) with a relative direction (*πρὸς τοῦ Ταναΐδος*)? Cp. c. 121 *supra*.

Between the Istros and the Tanais the Scyths and the Persians would have had to cross, on the historian's own showing (cc. 51-57 *supra*) at least six rivers, of which this story takes no account. The distance on the most favourable computation for a single traveller may be reckoned, on the historian's own showing, at twenty days, c. 101 *supra*; for huge armies such as are here in motion at least twice as much time is to be allowed. The territory of the Sauromatae extended fifteen days' journey from the mouth of the Tanais (c. 21 *supra*) northwards. What was the extent of the territory of the Budini is not mentioned: but

Βουδίνων. ὅσον μὲν δὴ χρόνον οἱ Πέρσαι ἤισαν διὰ τῆς Σκυθικῆς 123
καὶ τῆς Σαυρομάτιδος χώρης, οἱ δὲ εἶχον οὐδὲν σίνεσθαι ἅτε
τῆς χώρης ἐούσης χέρσου· ἐπείτε δὲ ἐς τὴν τῶν Βουδίνων
χώρην ἐσέβαλλον, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ἐντυχόντες τῷ ξυλίνῳ τείχεϊ,
ἐκλελοιπότων τῶν Βουδίνων καὶ κεκενωμένου τοῦ τείχεος πάντων,
ἐνέπρησαν αὐτό. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαντες εἵποντο αἰεὶ τὸ πρόσω
κατὰ στίβον, ἐς ὃ διεξελθόντες ταύτην ἐς τὴν ἔρημον ἀπίκοντο.
ἡ δὲ ἔρημος αὕτη ὑπὸ οὐδαμῶν νέμεται ἀνδρῶν, κέεται δὲ ὑπὲρ
τῆς Βουδίνων χώρης ἐοῦσα πλῆθος ἑπτὰ ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ. ὑπὲρ δὲ
τῆς ἐρήμου Θυσσαγέται οἰκέουσι, ποταμοὶ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν τέσσερες
μεγάλοι ῥέοντες διὰ Μαιητέων ἐκδιδοῦσι ἐς τὴν λίμνην τὴν
καλεομένην Μαιῆτιν, τοῖσι οὐνόματα κέεται τάδε, Λύκος Ὄαρος
Τάναϊς Σύργις.
Ἐπεὶ ὦν ὁ Δαρεῖος ἦλθε ἐς τὴν ἔρημον, παυσάμενος τοῦ 124
δρόμου ἵδρυσε τὴν στρατιὴν ἐπὶ ποταμῷ Ὀάρῳ. τοῦτο δὲ
ποιήσας ὀκτὼ τείχεα ἐτείχεε μεγάλα, ἴσον ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων ἀπέχοντα,

---

what is to become of Dareios' return within sixty days (c. 98 *supra*)?

123. 2. **οἱ δέ,** *in apodosi*, c. 94 *supra* and *passim*.

3. **χέρσου,** 'dry, barren,' L. & S. Yet they must have passed through the land of the Georgi and Aroteres. Cp. cc. 17, 18 *supra*.

4. **τὸ ξ. τεῖχος,** c. 108 *supra*.

9. **πλῆθος.** Used similarly of space in regard to Caucasus, the trans-Caucasian region, 1. 203, 204 *ὀρέων πλήθεϊ μέγιστον. πεδίον πλῆθος ἄπειρον ἐς ἔποψιν.*

ἑπτά. This statement agrees with the statement on the same subject, c. 22 *supra*, which proves only that statements drawn from different sources do not always contradict each other.

10. **Θυσσαγέται.** Cp. c. 22 *supra*. The geography introduced here is like an afterthought, probably from a fresh source. The Maietae must be located between the Sarmatae on the north, c. 21 *supra*, and the Sindi on the south, cc. 28-86 *supra*.

Syrgis has appeared before as the Hyrgis, c. 57, the two passages being obviously independent. Hansen, *Ost-Europa*, § 85, suggests that the final ς in *Τάναϊς* is the source of an error here. Oaros might pass for the *name* of the Wolga which flows into the *Caspian*. The identity of the Lykos is lost. Forbiger, *Alte Geogr.* iii. 1115, is worth consulting.

124. 3. **τείχεα ἐτείχεε.** Even those prepared to extend Hdt.'s travels liberally draw the line at these forts (cp. Rawlinson *ad l.*) and notwithstanding the remarkable formula, *τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν*, deny that he can have seen the remains which he here describes. Two further questions arise: whether Dareios built these, or any such, forts; and whether the forts described in the text ever existed at all. In regard to the first question: "it is extremely unlikely that any forts were built in Scythia by Darius" (Rawlinson). It is of course still more unlikely that Dareios built any forts far beyond Scythia, beyond Sauromatae, Budini, on the edge of the desert, on the banks of the Oaros. It is in fact absolutely incredible. But did these erections exist in Hdt.'s own day? That 'ruined barrows' existed within and beyond the confines of Scythia is indeed highly probable; but that there existed on the banks of the Oaros eight such ruins at regular distances of about sixty stadii, or seven and a half R. miles, seems less probable. Hdt. does not mention the material of which these remains consisted. It may perhaps be that some confusion between tumuli or barrows, and some stations on a trade-route, underlies the suspicious symmetry of these distances (cp. the Libyan oases, c. 181 *infra*). Anyway these archaeological remains, which

σταδίους ὡς ἑξήκοντα μάλιστά κῃ· τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν. ἐν ᾧ δὲ οὗτος πρὸς ταῦτα ἐτράπετο, οἱ διωκόμενοι Σκύθαι περιελθόντες τὰ κατύπερθε ὑπέστρεφον ἐς τὴν Σκυθικήν. ἀφανισθέντων δὲ τούτων τὸ παράπαν, ὡς οὐκέτι ἐφαντάζοντό σφι, οὕτω δὴ ὁ Δαρεῖος τείχεα μὲν ἐκεῖνα ἡμίεργα μετῆκε, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑποστρέψας ἤιε πρὸς ἑσπέρην, δοκέων τούτους τε πάντας τοὺς
125 Σκύθας εἶναι καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέρην σφέας φεύγειν. ἐλαύνων δὲ τὴν ταχίστην τὸν στρατὸν ὡς ἐς τὴν Σκυθικὴν ἀπίκετο, ἐνέκυρσε ἀμφοτέρῃσι τῇσι μοίρῃσι τῶν Σκυθέων, ἐντυχὼν δὲ ἐδίωκε ὑπεκφέροντας ἡμέρης ὁδῷ. καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἀνίει ἐπιὼν ὁ Δαρεῖος, οἱ Σκύθαι κατὰ τὰ βεβουλευμένα ὑπέφευγον ἐς τῶν ἀπειπαμένων τὴν σφετέρην συμμαχίην, πρώτην δὲ ἐς τῶν Μελαγχλαίνων τὴν γῆν. ὡς δὲ ἐσβαλόντες τούτους ἐτάραξαν οἵ τε Σκύθαι καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι, κατηγέοντο οἱ Σκύθαι ἐς τῶν Ἀνδροφάγων τοὺς χώρους· ταραχθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων ὑπῆγον ἐπὶ τὴν Νευρίδα· ταρασσομένων δὲ καὶ τούτων ἤισαν ὑποφεύγοντες οἱ Σκύθαι ἐς τοὺς Ἀγαθύρσους. Ἀγάθυρσοι δὲ ὁρέοντες καὶ τοὺς ὁμούρους φεύγοντας ὑπὸ Σκυθέων καὶ τεταραγμένους, πρὶν ἤ σφι ἐμβαλεῖν τοὺς Σκύθας πέμψαντες κήρυκα ἀπηγόρευον Σκύθῃσι μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν τῶν σφετέρων οὔρων, προλέγοντες ὡς εἰ πειρήσονται ἐσβαλόντες, σφίσι πρῶτα διαμαχήσονται. Ἀγάθυρσοι μὲν προείπαντες ταῦτα ἐβοήθεον ἐπὶ τοὺς οὔρους, ἐρύκειν ἐν νόῳ ἔχοντες τοὺς ἐπιόντας· Μελάγχλαινοι δὲ καὶ Ἀνδροφάγοι καὶ Νευροὶ ἐσβαλόντων τῶν Περσέων ἅμα Σκύθῃσι οὔτε πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο ἐπιλαθόμενοί τε τῆς ἀπειλῆς ἔφευγον αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς

---

would be such admirable evidence, if only they were genuine, throw some light upon the character of Hdt.'s materials and methods, not altogether to his credit: and the personal formula here (*τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν*), which suggests autopsy, and yet is disallowed even by the least sceptical Herodotean critics, may justify scepticism in other less clear cases. Cp. Introduction, p. xcvi.

125. 3. **ἀμφοτέρῃσι.** The two divisions of the Scyths must be supposed to have joined, though this is the first intimation of their junction.

5. **τῶν ἀπειπαμένων.** The tribes are here given in order from E. to W. c. 102 *supra*. The rhetoric of the passage is remarkable, and may be exhibited in a diagram as follows:

ὑπέφευγον . .	ἐς τῶν Μελαγχλαίνων τὴν γῆν . .	ὡς τούτους ἐτάραξαν
κατηγέοντο .	ἐς τῶν Ἀνδροφάγων τοὺς χώρους	ταραχθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων
ὑπῆγον . . .	ἐπὶ τὴν Νευρίδα .	ταρασσομένων δὲ καὶ τούτων
ἤισαν ὑποφεύγοντες . .	ἐς τοὺς Ἀγαθύρσους	. . . .

13. **κήρυκα.** Thoroughly Greek: not a mere *ἄγγελον*, cp. c. 131 *infra*.

The Agathyrsi, like the Getae, c. 93 *supra*, whose neighbours they were, are prepared to stand up for their liberty. Fraternity and equality are also their watchwords, cp. c. 104 *supra*. They were better worth attacking than their neighbours, having gold galore, but the defence of their frontiers would have been facilitated by the mountain rampart of the Carpathians, which Hdt. omits to mention.

19. **αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς βορέω ἐς τὴν ἔρημον.**

βορέω ἐς τὴν ἔρημον τεταραγμένοι. οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι ἐς μὲν τοὺς
Ἀγαθύρσους οὐκέτι ἀπείπαντας ἀπικνέοντο, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῆς Νευρίδος
χώρης ἐς τὴν σφετέρην κατηγέοντο τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι.
Ὡς δὲ πολλὸν τοῦτο ἐγίνετο καὶ οὐκ ἐπαύετο, πέμψας Δαρεῖος 126
ἱππέα παρὰ τὸν Σκυθέων βασιλέα Ἰδάνθυρσον ἔλεγε τάδε. "δαι-
μόνιε ἀνδρῶν, τί φεύγεις αἰεί, ἐξεόν τοι τῶνδε τὰ ἕτερα ποιέειν;
εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀξιόχρεος δοκέεις εἶναι σεωυτῷ τοῖσι ἐμοῖσι πρήγμασι
ἀντιωθῆναι, σὺ δὲ στάς τε καὶ παυσάμενος πλάνης μάχεσθαι·
εἰ δὲ συγγινώσκεαι εἶναι ἥσσων, σὺ δὲ καὶ οὕτω παυσάμενος τοῦ
δρόμου δεσπότῃ τῷ σῷ δῶρα φέρων γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ ἐλθὲ ἐς
λόγους." πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Σκυθέων βασιλεὺς Ἰδάνθυρσος λέγει τάδε. 127
"οὕτω τὸ ἐμὸν ἔχει, ὦ Πέρσα. ἐγὼ οὐδένα κω ἀνθρώπων
δείσας ἔφυγον οὔτε πρότερον οὔτε νῦν σὲ φεύγω, οὐδέ τι νεώτερόν
εἰμι ποιήσας νῦν ἢ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐώθεα ποιέειν. ὅ τι δὲ οὐκ
αὐτίκα μάχομαί τοι, ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο σημανέω. ἡμῖν οὔτε ἄστεα
οὔτε γῆ πεφυτευμένη ἐστί, τῶν πέρι δείσαντες μὴ ἁλῷ ἢ καρῇ
ταχύτερον ἂν ὑμῖν συμμίσγοιμεν ἐς μάχην. εἰ δὲ δέοι πάντως
ἐς τοῦτο κατὰ τάχος ἀπικνέεσθαι, τυγχάνουσι ἡμῖν ἐόντες τάφοι
πατρώιοι· φέρετε, τούτους ἀνευρόντες συγχέειν πειρᾶσθε αὐτούς,
καὶ γνώσεσθε τότε εἴτε ὑμῖν μαχησόμεθα περὶ τῶν τάφων εἴτε
καὶ οὐ μαχησόμεθα. πρότερον δέ, ἢν μὴ ἡμέας λόγος αἱρέῃ, οὐ
συμμίξομέν τοι. ἀμφὶ μὲν μάχῃ τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω, δεσπότας δὲ
ἐμοὺς ἐγὼ Δία τε νομίζω τὸν ἐμὸν πρόγονον καὶ Ἱστίην τὴν
Σκυθέων βασίλειαν μούνους εἶναι. σοὶ δὲ ἀντὶ μὲν δώρων γῆς
τε καὶ ὕδατος δῶρα πέμψω τοιαῦτα οἷά σοι πρέπει ἐλθεῖν, ἀντὶ
δὲ τοῦ ὅτι δεσπότης ἔφησας εἶναι ἐμός, κλαίειν λέγω." [τοῦτό
ἐστι ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ῥῆσις.]

Cp. c. 121. The meaning here can only be 'northwards into the desert.'

21. **οὐκέτι**, with ἀπικνέοντο.

126. 2. **Ἰδάνθυρσον.** See c. 120 *supra*. **δαιμόνιε**, not 'miserable' (Schweighäuser), but 'marvellous,' extraordinary. Cp. 7. 48, 8. 84.

6. **σὺ δέ**, δὲ *in apodosi*, *bis*, cp. c. 94.

127. 6. **πεφυτευμένη.** Planted with fruit-trees, cp. L. & S. *sub v.*, cp. c. 19 *supra*.

8. **τάφοι** in Gerrhos c. 71, the meridian of which Dareios had twice crossed in his wild chase. There is a hint of Ancestor worship in the epithet.

11. **λόγος.** Cp. 1. 132 *ad f.* ὅ τι μιν λόγος αἱρέει, 7. 41 ὅκως μιν λόγος αἱρέοι. Popular terminology as illustrated in Hdt. had not reached the stricter philosophic distinctions between λόγος and φωνή on the one side, and λόγος and θυμός or ἐπιθυμία on the other. Cp. c. 113 *supra*.

13. **Δία . . τὸν ἐμὸν πρόγονον.** Cp. c. 5 *supra* where, according to the Scythian account, Targitaos the father of the three original Scythians, is son of Zeus.

Ἱστίην τὴν Σκ. βασίλειαν. For Histia Basileia see c. 59 *supra*, and cp. c. 68, Appendix I.

16. **κλαίειν.** Cp. κλάειν κελεύων Λάμαχον τὸν Γοργάσου *Acharn.* 1131 and Aristoph. *passim*.

17. **ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ῥῆσις** was a proverbial expression, or became such, for any rough and ready answer, as appears from Diog. Laert. 1. 101.

128 Ὁ μὲν δὴ κῆρυξ οἰχώκεε ἀγγελέων ταῦτα Δαρείῳ, οἱ δὲ Σκυθέων βασιλέες ἀκούσαντες τῆς δουλοσύνης τὸ οὔνομα ὀργῆς ἐπλήσθησαν. τὴν μὲν δὴ μετὰ Σαυροματέων μοῖραν ταχθεῖσαν, τῆς ἦρχε Σκώπασις, πέμπουσι Ἴωσι κελεύοντες ἐς λόγους ἀπικέσθαι, τούτοισι οἳ τὸν Ἴστρον ἐζευγμένον ἐφρούρεον· αὐτῶν δὲ τοῖσι ὑπολειπομένοισι ἔδοξε πλανᾶν μὲν μηκέτι Πέρσας, σῖτα δὲ ἑκάστοτε ἀναιρεομένοισι ἐπιτίθεσθαι. νωμῶντες ὦν σῖτα ἀναιρεομένους τοὺς Δαρείου ἐποίευν τὰ βεβουλευμένα. ἡ μὲν δὴ ἵππος τὴν ἵππον αἰεὶ τράπεσκε ἡ τῶν Σκυθέων, οἱ δὲ τῶν Περσέων ἱππόται φεύγοντες ἐσέπιπτον ἐς τὸν πεζόν, ὁ δὲ πεζὸς ἂν ἐπεκούρεε· οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι ἐσαράξαντες τὴν ἵππον ὑπέστρεφον τὸν πεζὸν φοβεόμενοι. ἐποιέοντο δὲ καὶ τὰς νύκτας παραπλησίας

129 προσβολὰς οἱ Σκύθαι. τὸ δὲ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσί τε ἦν σύμμαχον καὶ τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι ἀντίξοον ἐπιτιθεμένοισι τῷ Δαρείου στρατοπέδῳ, θῶμα μέγιστον ἐρέω [τῶν τε ὄνων ἡ φωνὴ καὶ τῶν ἡμιόνων τὸ εἶδος]. οὔτε γὰρ ὄνον οὔτε ἡμίονον γῆ ἡ Σκυθικὴ φέρει, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι δεδήλωται, οὐδὲ ἔστι ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ πάσῃ χώρῃ τὸ παράπαν οὔτε ὄνος οὔτε ἡμίονος διὰ τὰ ψύχεα. ὑβρίζοντες ὦν οἱ ὄνοι ἐτάρασσον τὴν ἵππον τῶν Σκυθέων. πολλάκις δὲ ἐπελαυνόντων ἐπὶ τοὺς Πέρσας μεταξὺ ὅκως ἀκούσειαν οἱ ἵπποι τῶν ὄνων τῆς φωνῆς, ἐταράσσοντό τε ὑποστρεφόμενοι καὶ ἐν θώματι ἔσκον, ὀρθὰ ἱστάντες τὰ ὦτα, ἅτε οὔτε ἀκούσαντες

It was apparently derived from this passage, or from this story. Cp. Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 305, quoted by Stein: *ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ῥῆσις τί ἐστιν; Ἰδάνθυρσος Σκυθῶν βασιλεὺς Δαρείου πέμψαντος ὡς αὐτὸν πρέσβεις καὶ κελεύσαντος ἢ ὑπακούειν ἢ ὑπομεῖναι τὸ κινδυνεύειν ἀπεκρίνατο οἰμώζειν Δαρείῳ, κτλ.* The words have been bracketed by Valckenaer, Dietsch, Stein, and others. But all the MSS. exhibit them: the phrase may very well have become notorious and proverbial long before Hdt.'s time, and we are not to assume that the later authors all took the anecdote from him, indeed the variations in the phraseology seem to show that they are not quoting him.

128. 2. δουλοσύνης. Strictly speaking they had only heard the correlative *δεσπότης*, c. 126 *supra*.

4. **τῆς ἦρχε Σκώπασις.** The first *μοῖρα* of c. 120 *supra*. *ἦρχε*, he not being *βασιλεύς* of the Sauromatae. Cp. *l.c.*

Ἴωσι with *ἐς λόγους ἀπικέσθαι*, cp. c. 133 *infra*.

6. **τοῖσι ὑπολειπομένοισι.** The two divisions of Scyths under Idanthyrsos and Taxakis, together with the Budini and Geloni (c. 120 *supra*), which last, it may be observed, had taken the destruction of their city very quietly (c. 123 *supra*).

7. **νωμῶντες** observing. L. & S. *sub v.* II. 3. p. 1015.

11. **ἐσαράξαντες τὴν ἵππον,** 'After driving the cavalry in upon the foot,' cp. 5. 116 *ἐσαράξαντές σφεας ἐς τὰς νέας*.

129. 4. ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι δεδήλωται. The reference is to c. 28 *supra* where the assertion is made: *ἵπποι δὲ ἀνεχόμενοι φέρουσι τὸν χειμῶνα τοῦτον ἡμίονοι δὲ οὐδὲ ὄνοι οὐκ ἀνέχονται ἀρχήν*, which may be taken for proof that *οὔτε ὄνον οὔτε ἡμίονον γῆ ἡ Σκυθικὴ φέρει κτλ.*

6. **ὑβρίζοντες,** letting off steam, 'braying'; though not because they were 'over-fed' (as L. & S. say, p. 1594). The word is not usual of sound, but the next sentence makes the meaning here plain, and the conjecture *βρωμώμενοι* (van H.) unacceptable.

9. **φωνῆς.** See c. 114 *supra*.

10. **ὀρθὰ ἱστάντες τὰ ὦτα.** This is very

πρότερον φωνῆς τοιαύτης οὔτε ἰδόντες τὸ εἶδος. ταῦτα μέν νυν 130
ἐπὶ σμικρόν τι ἐφέροντο τοῦ πολέμου. οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι ὅκως τοὺς
Πέρσας ἴδοιεν τεθορυβημένους, ἵνα παραμένοιέν τε ἐπὶ πλέω
χρόνον ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ καὶ παραμένοντες ἀνιῴατο τῶν πάντων
ἐπιδευέες ἐόντες, ἐποίεον τοιάδε· ὅκως τῶν προβάτων τῶν
σφετέρων αὐτῶν καταλίποιεν μετὰ τῶν νομέων, αὐτοὶ ἂν ὑπεξή-
λαυνον ἐς ἄλλον χῶρον· οἱ δὲ ἂν Πέρσαι ἐπελθόντες λάβεσκον
τὰ πρόβατα καὶ λαβόντες ἐπηείροντο ἂν τῷ πεποιημένῳ.
πολλάκις δὲ τοιούτου γινομένου, τέλος Δαρεῖός τε ἐν ἀπορίῃσι 131
εἴχετο, καὶ οἱ Σκυθέων βασιλέες μαθόντες τοῦτο ἔπεμπον κήρυκα
δῶρα Δαρείῳ φέροντα ὄρνιθά τε καὶ μῦν καὶ βάτραχον καὶ
ὀιστοὺς πέντε. Πέρσαι δὲ τὸν φέροντα τὰ δῶρα ἐπειρώτεον τὸν

---

graphic, but does not prove autopsy, at least on the occasion ostensibly described.

130. 1. ταῦτα . . πολέμου. This short sentence has occasioned the commentators a good deal of trouble. Larcher renders: "Mais c'étoit un foible avantage." Rawlinson: "it was not without some little influence on the progress of the war." Baehr gives practically the same in his German translation: "Es hatte diess immerhin einen, wenn auch geringen Einfluss auf die Führung des Kriegs." These renderings all take *ταῦτα* as nominative and as the subject of *ἐφέροντο*. Schweighäuser, Gaisford and Baehr, ed.[2] n. *ad l.*, take *ταῦτα* as object and *οἱ Πέρσαι* (understood) as subject of the verb. "Atque hoc, leve quidem, sed aliquid tamen ad belli successum Persae adepti sunt." So apparently L. & S. "this they received as a small help towards the war," p. 1663. Stein also takes this view of the grammar, but understands *ἐπὶ σμικρὸν τοῦ πολεμοῦ* of time: 'these were the advantages which the Persians gained for quite a short time (for the horses soon grew accustomed to the noise).' Stein also would transfer the sentence *πολλάκις* (*om.* *δὲ*) . . . *εἶδος* so as to take the place of the sentence bracketed in c. 129 *supra*. Mr. Macaulay renders: "So far then the Persians had the advantage for a small part of the war" and gives as an alternative: "with some slight effect on the course of the war."

There are two objections to taking *ταῦτα* as the subject of *ἐφέροντο*: (1) the neut. with the pl. verb, (2) the use of the middle voice. The second seems insuperable; otherwise we might interpret this passage in the light of 8. 62 *τὸ πᾶν ἡμῖν τοῦ πολέμου φέρουσι αἱ νῆες*. But this passage may serve to show that *σμικρόν τι τοῦ πολέμου* is not here to be taken temporally. I suggest therefore as the sense: 'The Persians gained very little in (by) these feats towards deciding the war,' *i.e.* it was little that the Persians gained for the real issue by the braying of their asses and mules. This interpretation seems to add a rhetorical to the grammatical advantage.

5. **τοιάδε.** They must have starved themselves to feed the Persians, for they had only kept just enough for their own wants, c. 121 *supra*, to say nothing of the inconsequence of their action, in keeping their enemies' table supplied. Larcher defends the passage against Wesseling who wanted to amend it on some such rationalistic grounds, and Baehr[2] supports Larcher. Such rationalism is indeed misplaced. The passage wants no amending; it is perfectly of a piece with the whole story of the campaign: it is necessary to fill up to the brim the cup of folly and confusion which is here presented to the Great King, for the edification of the Hellenes.

6. **νομέων.** Presumably slaves. The indication accords imperfectly with the rationale of Scythian slavery given c. 2 *supra*.

131. 1. πολλάκις. Larcher makes a great point of the partitive genitive *τῶν προβάτων*, but is judiciously silent over this *πολλάκις*.

2. **κήρυκα.** Not a mere *ἄγγελος*, cp. c. 125 *supra*. Everything must be done correctly.

4. **ὀιστοὺς πέντε.** Cp. c. 64 *supra*.

νόον τῶν διδομένων· ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἔφη οἱ ἐπεστάλθαι ἄλλο ἢ δόντα
τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι· αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας ἐκέλευε,
132 εἰ σοφοί εἰσι, γνῶναι τὸ θέλει τὰ δῶρα λέγειν. ταῦτα ἀκού-
σαντες οἱ Πέρσαι ἐβουλεύοντο. Δαρείου μέν νυν ἡ γνώμη ἦν Σκύθας ἑωυτῷ διδόναι σφέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ, εἰκάζων τῇδε, ὡς μῦς μὲν ἐν γῇ γίνεται καρπὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπῳ σιτεόμενος, βάτραχος δὲ ἐν ὕδατι, ὄρνις δὲ μάλιστα ἔοικε ἵππῳ, τοὺς δὲ ὀιστοὺς ὡς τὴν ἑωυτῶν ἀλκὴν παραδιδοῦσι. αὕτη μὲν Δαρείῳ ἀπεδέδεκτο ἡ γνώμη. συνεστήκεε δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ γνώμῃ ἡ Γοβρύεω, τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἑπτὰ ἑνὸς τῶν τὸν Μάγον κατελόντων, εἰκάζοντος τὰ δῶρα λέγειν "ἢν μὴ ὄρνιθες γενόμενοι ἀναπτῆσθε ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὦ Πέρσαι, ἢ μύες γενόμενοι κατὰ τῆς γῆς καταδύητε, ἢ βάτραχοι γενόμενοι ἐς τὰς λίμνας ἐσπηδήσητε, οὐκ ἀπονοστήσετε ὀπίσω ὑπὸ τῶνδε τῶν τοξευμάτων βαλλόμενοι."

133 Πέρσαι μὲν δὴ τὰ δῶρα εἴκαζον. ἡ δὲ Σκυθέων μία μοῖρα ἡ ταχθεῖσα πρότερον μὲν παρὰ τὴν Μαιῆτιν λίμνην φρουρέειν, τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον Ἴωσι ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν, ὡς ἀπίκετο ἐπὶ τὴν γέφυραν, ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ἐλευθερίην ἥκομεν ὑμῖν φέροντες, ἤν πέρ γε ἐθέλητε ἐσακούειν. πυνθανόμεθα γὰρ Δαρεῖον ἐντείλασθαι ὑμῖν ἑξήκοντα ἡμέρας μούνας φρουρήσαντας

---

132. 2. **Δαρείου . . εἰκάζων.** Cp. 2. 15 Ἰώνων . . λέγοντες . . λεγόντων, and contrast Γοβρύεω . . εἰκάζοντος just below.

"The Steppes of South Russia swarm with rodents, to all which the Greeks applied indiscriminately the general term mice." Neumann, p. 287, quoting Hippokrates *de Aer.* 19.

5. **ὄρνις.** Explained as a symbol of the Air would obviously have been both logical and sarcastic, but have ill-suited the King's moral. The bird resembles the horse in rapidity, and the horse might be taken as the most valuable possession of the Scyth. Dareios is not yet out of his optimistic vein (cp. c. 88 *supra*): but he might have realised that if the Scyths had meant a horse they would have sent a horse.

7. **συνεστήκεε.** See L. & S. *sub v.* B. II. 2. p. 1494. Gobryas was something more than one of the Seven; he was the one who, if the story in 3. 78 be true, in the supreme moment had nearly given his life for Dareios. He was the son of one Mardonios (Marduniyahya: *Behistun Inscr.* col. 4, § 18), and the father of another, whose name was familiar to every Greek, 6. 43 and 7-9 *passim*. According to 7. 2 Dareios had married a daughter of Gobryas before he came to the throne.

133. 1. **τὰ δῶρα εἴκαζον.** Rather slovenly grammar for τὸν νόον τῶν δώρων c. 131 *supra* (St.) or τὸ θέλει τὰ δ. λέγειν. But such slips are not uncommon in any language (*e.g.* "The embassy sent by the Greeks . . . as told by Hdt., is so lively and dramatic etc." Freeman's *Sicily*, vol. ii. p. 515, meaning 'the story of the embassy'). Cp. c. 134, l. 6.

μία μοῖρα. Under Skopasis, c. 128.

4. **ἔλεγε,** *sc.* ἡ μία μοῖρα: they cannot all have spoken at once, though some of them may have spoken Greek.

6. **ἑξήκοντα.** Sixty days must have passed and gone long before, if the previous narrative were anything like correct. Cp. note c. 122 *supra*. How the Scyths had come by this information there has been nothing to show. One can hardly suppose that the horseman sent by Dareios to Idanthyrsos in c. 126 had betrayed the fact.

τὴν γέφυραν, αὐτοῦ μὴ παραγενομένου ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ,
ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἐς τὴν ὑμετέρην. νῦν ὦν ὑμεῖς τάδε ποιεῦντες
ἐκτὸς μὲν ἔσεσθε πρὸς ἐκείνου αἰτίης, ἐκτὸς δὲ πρὸς ἡμέων· τὰς
προκειμένας ἡμέρας παραμείναντες τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου ἀπαλλάσ-
σεσθε." οὗτοι μέν νυν ὑποδεξαμένων Ἰώνων ποιήσειν ταῦτα
ὀπίσω τὴν ταχίστην ἐπείγοντο. Πέρσῃσι δὲ μετὰ τὰ δῶρα 134
ἐλθόντα Δαρείῳ ἀντετάχθησαν οἱ ὑπολειφθέντες Σκύθαι πεζῷ
καὶ ἵπποισι ὡς συμβαλέοντες. τεταγμένοισι δὲ τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι
λαγὸς ἐς τὸ μέσον διήιξε· τῶν δὲ ὡς ἕκαστοι ὥρων τὸν λαγὸν
ἐδίωκον. ταραχθέντων δὲ τῶν Σκυθέων καὶ βοῇ χρεωμένων,
εἴρετο ὁ Δαρεῖος τῶν ἀντιπολεμίων τὸν θόρυβον· πυθόμενος δέ
σφεας τὸν λαγὸν διώκοντας, εἶπε ἄρα πρὸς τούς περ ἐώθεε καὶ
τὰ ἄλλα λέγειν "οὗτοι ὦνδρες ἡμέων πολλὸν καταφρονέουσι,
καί μοι νῦν φαίνεται Γοβρύης εἶπαι περὶ τῶν Σκυθικῶν δώρων
ὀρθῶς. ὡς ὦν οὕτω ἤδη δοκεόντων καὶ αὐτῷ μοι ἔχειν, βουλῆς
ἀγαθῆς δεῖ, ὅκως ἀσφαλέως ἡ κομιδὴ ἡμῖν ἔσται τὸ ὀπίσω."
πρὸς ταῦτα Γοβρύης εἶπε "ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐγὼ σχεδὸν μὲν καὶ λόγῳ
ἠπιστάμην τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὴν ἀπορίην, ἐλθὼν δὲ μᾶλλον
ἐξέμαθον, ὁρέων αὐτοὺς ἐμπαίζοντας ἡμῖν. νῦν ὦν μοι δοκέει,
ἐπεὰν τάχιστα νὺξ ἐπέλθῃ, ἐκκαύσαντας τὰ πυρὰ ὡς ἐώθαμεν
καὶ ἄλλοτε ποιέειν, τῶν στρατιωτέων τοὺς ἀσθενεστάτους ἐς τὰς
ταλαιπωρίας ἐξαπατήσαντας καὶ τοὺς ὄνους πάντας καταδή-
σαντας ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι, πρὶν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον ἰθῦσαι
Σκύθας λύσοντας τὴν γέφυραν, ἢ καί τι Ἴωσι δόξαι τὸ ἡμέας
οἷόν τε ἔσται ἐξεργάσασθαι."

Γοβρύης μὲν ταῦτα συνεβούλευε. μετὰ δὲ νύξ τε ἐγίνετο 135
καὶ Δαρεῖος ἐχρᾶτο τῇ γνώμῃ ταύτῃ· τοὺς μὲν καματηροὺς τῶν

---

134. 1. **μετὰ τὰ δῶρα ἐλθόντα** = *μετὰ τὴν ἄπιξιν τῶν δώρων.*

2. **οἱ ὑπολειφθέντες.** The two divisions of Scyths under Idanthyrsos and Taxakis with the Budini and Geloni, c. 120.

πεζῷ. Was this force, as Stein suggests, supplied by the Budini? If so, they must have been good walkers. Is it worth while to rationalise such details in a legend? If there was to be a battle-array infantry was needed: but the Herodotean legend does not call upon the Scythian *πεζός* to fight. But cp. c. 46 *supra.*

4. **διήιξε.** Through the ranks of Scyths.

ἕκαστοι, each group (or troop).

6. **εἴρετο . . τὸν θόρυβον,** *sc.* *ὅτι εἴη*: cp. c. 133 *τὰ δῶρα εἴκαζον.*

7. **εἶπε κτλ.** This incident lowers the pride of Dareios, and he comes to his senses: thus are great conversions effected upon small occasions! Dareios, like Xerxes, gat him safe home after his act of *ὕβρις*, and this was unfortunate for Hellenic theories; but at any rate he could be made ridiculous, and he was. There is the comic as well as the tragic Nemesis: Xerxes and his father alike incurred it.

13. **ἀπορίην.** Cp. c. 83 *supra.*

16. **τοὺς ἀσθενεστάτους.** The Persians have as little regard for their feeble folk as the Scyths for their herdsmen, c. 130 *supra.*

ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν ἦν ἐλάχιστος ἀπολλυμένων λόγος, καὶ τοὺς ὄνους πάντας καταδήσας κατέλιπε αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ. κατέλιπε δὲ τούς τε ὄνους καὶ τοὺς ἀσθενέας τῆς στρατιῆς τῶνδε εἵνεκεν, ἵνα οἱ μὲν ὄνοι βοὴν παρέχωνται· οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἀσθενείης μὲν εἵνεκεν κατελείποντο, προφάσιος δὲ τῆσδε δηλαδή, ὡς αὐτὸς μὲν σὺν τῷ καθαρῷ τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐπιθήσεσθαι μέλλοι τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι, οὗτοι δὲ τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ῥυοίατο. ταῦτα τοῖσι ὑπολελειμμένοισι ὑποθέμενος ὁ Δαρεῖος καὶ πυρὰ ἐκκαύσας τὴν ταχίστην ἐπείγετο ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον. οἱ δὲ ὄνοι ἐρημωθέντες τοῦ ὁμίλου οὕτω δὴ μᾶλλον πολλῷ ἵεσαν τῆς φωνῆς· ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ Σκύθαι τῶν ὄνων πάγχυ κατὰ

136 χώρην ἤλπιζον τοὺς Πέρσας εἶναι. ἡμέρης δὲ γενομένης γνόντες οἱ ὑπολειφθέντες ὡς προδεδομένοι εἶεν ὑπὸ Δαρείου, χεῖράς τε προετείνοντο τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι καὶ ἔλεγον τὰ κατήκοντα· οἱ δὲ ὡς ἤκουσαν ταῦτα τὴν ταχίστην συστραφέντες, αἵ τε δύο μοῖραι τῶν Σκυθέων καὶ ἡ μία καὶ Σαυρομάται καὶ Βουδῖνοι καὶ Γελωνοί, ἐδίωκον τοὺς Πέρσας ἰθὺ τοῦ Ἴστρου. ἅτε δὲ τοῦ Περσικοῦ μὲν τοῦ πολλοῦ ἐόντος πεζοῦ στρατοῦ καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς οὐκ ἐπισταμένου, ὥστε οὐ τετμημενέων τῶν ὁδῶν, τοῦ δὲ Σκυθικοῦ ἱππότεω καὶ τὰ σύντομα τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐπισταμένου, ἁμαρτόντες ἀλλήλων, ἔφθησαν πολλῷ οἱ Σκύθαι τοὺς Πέρσας ἐπὶ τὴν γέφυραν ἀπικόμενοι. μαθόντες δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας οὔκω ἀπιγμένους ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς Ἴωνας ἐόντας ἐν τῇσι νηυσί "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, αἵ τε ἡμέραι ὑμῖν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ διοίχηνται καὶ οὐ ποιέετε

---

135. 4. **καταδήσας.** Applies only to the *ὄνους*, not to the *ἄνδρας*.

6. **βοήν.** Stronger than *φωνή*, cp. c. 129.

7. **πρόφασις** by itself does not necessarily imply deception. Cp. c. 165 *infra*, 6. 49, 2. 161, Thuc. 1. 23, 6.

8. In 1. 211 **ὁ καθαρὸς στρατὸς** is opposed to *ὁ ἀχρήιος*, and the sense is practically the same here.

10. **ῥυοίατο.** Cp. 6. 7 *τὰ τείχεα ῥύεσθαι αὐτοὺς Μιλησίους*.

11. **οἱ δὲ . . φωνῆς.** This seems rather overdone, as there were plenty of animals and men about; nor is solitude known to have this effect upon the ass. The genitive, however, shows that they had some voice left: it was their being tied up, not their being deserted, that made them noisy. Moreover, this extra noise might have excited suspicion. But Hdt. is at home, day and night, in both camps, in the councils of the Great King, and in the heart of Histiaios: this ubiquity enhances the charm, but depreciates the credibility, of his narrative.

136. 3. **τὰ κατήκοντα** = *τὰ καθεστῶτα* as in 1. 97, 5. 49; *τὰ κατήκοντα τοῖς Σπαρτιήτῃσι*, 7. 104, is obviously different.

10. **οἱ Σκύθαι.** All three divisions of Scyths and the Sauromatae, Budini and Geloni. In c. 120 *supra ἡ μία* with the Sauromatae make up one army under Skopasis, while *αἱ δύο μ.* the great one under Idanthyrsos and the third under Taxakis together with the Budini and Geloni make up a second army. Here the two armies are massed, and the second offer and appeal to the Ionians is, with utmost dramatic skill, no mere repetition of the first, but an enlarged and altogether more impressive scene.

δίκαια ἔτι παραμένοντες. ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὶ πρότερον δειμαίνοντες ἐμένετε, νῦν λύσαντες τὸν πόρον τὴν ταχίστην ἄπιτε χαίροντες ἐλεύθεροι, θεοῖσί τε καὶ Σκύθῃσι εἰδότες χάριν. τὸν δὲ πρότερον ἐόντα ὑμέων δεσπότην ἡμεῖς παραστησόμεθα οὕτω ὥστε ἐπὶ μηδαμοὺς ἔτι ἀνθρώπους αὐτὸν στρατεύσασθαι."

Πρὸς ταῦτα Ἴωνες ἐβουλεύοντο. Μιλτιάδεω μὲν τοῦ Ἀθηναίου, 137
στρατηγέοντος καὶ τυραννεύοντος Χερσονησιτέων τῶν ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ, ἦν γνώμη πείθεσθαι Σκύθῃσι καὶ ἐλευθεροῦν Ἰωνίην, Ἱστιαίου δὲ τοῦ Μιλησίου ἐναντίη ταύτῃ, λέγοντος ὡς νῦν μὲν διὰ Δαρεῖον ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τυραννεύει πόλιος· τῆς Δαρείου δὲ δυνάμιος καταιρεθείσης οὔτε αὐτὸς Μιλησίων οἷός τε ἔσεσθαι ἄρχειν οὔτε ἄλλον οὐδένα οὐδαμῶν· βουλήσεσθαι γὰρ ἑκάστην τῶν πολίων δημοκρατέεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τυραννεύεσθαι. Ἱστιαίου δὲ γνώμην ταύτην ἀποδεικνυμένου αὐτίκα πάντες ἦσαν τετραμμένοι πρὸς ταύτην τὴν γνώμην, πρότερον τὴν Μιλτιάδεω αἱρεόμενοι.
ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι οἱ διαφέροντές τε τὴν ψῆφον καὶ ἐόντες λόγου 138

---

14. **δίκαια.** Their conduct involving a breach of faith—to the Scyths.

The Ionians by their refusal are to some extent made responsible for the subsequent invasion of Greece; though to be quite accurate Dareios apparently made no subsequent expedition in person (αὐτὸν cp. c. 1 *supra*). But the whole moral is obvious: had the Ionians acted on the advice of the Scyths, repeated with every circumstance calculated to make it impressive and acceptable, there never would have been a Persian invasion of Greece, cp. c. 142 *infra*. To be sure it was the Despots who were to blame: the cities preferred Democracies, c. 137. The story and its moral are largely coloured by Afterthought, and the philosophy of the passage is almost unimpeachable: *mais, ce n'est pas l'histoire*. Cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.

16. **θεοῖσί τε καὶ Σκύθῃσι.** Is there nothing intentionally humorous in this juxtaposition?

137. 1. **Μιλτιάδεω μέν.** Thirlwall (*Hist. of Greece*, vol. ii. App. 2) long ago pointed out the pragmatic tendency of this story, and traced it to its probable source. It was, one may almost say, doubtless, used on the occasion of the trial of Miltiades for 'tyranny' in the Chersonese, to which he was subject on his return to Athens in 493-2 B.C., cp. 6. 104 *infra*. That he should really have taken the line here ascribed to him at the Ister in 512 B.C. and remained still undisturbed for twenty years in possession of the τυραννὶς in the Chersonese, is well nigh incredible. Upon this subject see further notes to *l.c.* Introduction, p. lxxxvi. Appendix III. § 14.

Ἀθηναίου. If the advice of the *Athenian* had been taken the liberty of Ionia would have been secured there and then, without all the subsequent trouble. *Athenians* had ever been the champions of Ionia: it was well that this should be remembered.

5. **διὰ Δαρεῖον.** It was to their interest to maintain the king's power upon which their own depended. The dependence of the Greek tyrannis in the Asiatic towns upon the foreign supremacy, and not in the Asiatic towns alone, was a familiar truism of Greek thought at the time, and no doubt contributed to the unpopularity of the tyrannis, which this whole story was well calculated to augment and maintain. See further, c. 165 *infra*, 5. 37, 96, 6. 102.

8. **δημοκρατέεσθαι.** Hdt. will have it that they afterwards had their wish (cp. 6. 43 *infra*), and that from the Persians. See note *ad l. c.*

138. 1. **διαφέροντες τὴν ψῆφον,** 'voting in the division.' Stein suggests that Hdt. wrote: διαφέροντές τε τὴν ψῆφον πρὸς βασιλέος (on the king's side) καὶ ἐόντες λογιμώτατοι or λόγου πλείστου

πρὸς βασιλέος, Ἑλλησποντίων μὲν τύραννοι Δάφνις τε Ἀβυδηνὸς καὶ Ἵπποκλος Λαμψακηνὸς καὶ Ἡρόφαντος Παριηνὸς καὶ Μητρόδωρος Προκοννήσιος καὶ Ἀρισταγόρης Κυζικηνὸς καὶ Ἀρίστων Βυζάντιος. οὗτοι μὲν ἦσαν οἱ ἐξ Ἑλλησπόντου, ἀπ' Ἰωνίης δὲ Στράττις τε Χῖος καὶ Αἰάκης Σάμιος καὶ Λαοδάμας Φωκαιεὺς καὶ Ἱστιαῖος Μιλήσιος, τοῦ ἦν γνώμη ἡ προκειμένη ἐναντίη τῇ Μιλτιάδεω. Αἰολέων δὲ παρῆν λόγιμος μοῦνος

139 *Ἀρισταγόρης Κυμαῖος. οὗτοι ὦν ἐπείτε τὴν Ἱστιαίου αἱρέοντο γνώμην, ἔδοξέ σφι πρὸς ταύτῃ τάδε ἔργα τε καὶ ἔπεα προσθεῖναι, τῆς μὲν γεφύρης λύειν τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Σκύθας ἐόντα, λύειν δὲ ὅσον τόξευμα ἐξικνέεται, ἵνα καὶ ποιέειν τι δοκέωσι ποιεῦντες μηδὲν καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι μὴ πειρῴατο βιώμενοι [καὶ βουλόμενοι διαβῆναι τὸν Ἴστρον κατὰ τὴν γέφυραν], εἰπεῖν τε λύοντας τῆς γεφύρης τὸ ἐς τὴν Σκυθικὴν ἔχον ὡς πάντα ποιήσουσι τὰ Σκύθῃσί ἐστι ἐν ἡδονῇ. ταῦτα μὲν προσέθηκαν τῇ γνώμῃ· μετὰ δὲ ἐκ πάντων ὑπεκρίνατο Ἱστιαῖος τάδε λέγων. "ἄνδρες Σκύθαι, χρηστὰ ἥκετε φέροντες καὶ ἐς καιρὸν ἐπείγεσθε· καὶ τά τε ἀπ' ὑμέων ἡμῖν χρηστῶς ὁδοῦται καὶ τὰ ἀπ' ἡμέων ἐς ὑμέας ἐπιτηδέως ὑπηρετέεται. ὡς γὰρ ὁρᾶτε, καὶ λύομεν τὸν πόρον καὶ προθυμίην πᾶσαν ἕξομεν θέλοντες εἶναι ἐλεύθεροι. ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἡμεῖς τάδε λύομεν, ὑμέας καιρός ἐστι δίζησθαι ἐκείνους, εὑρόντας δὲ ὑπέρ τε ἡμέων καὶ ὑμέων αὐτῶν τίσασθαι οὕτω ὡς κείνους πρέπει."*

140 *Σκύθαι μὲν τὸ δεύτερον Ἴωσι πιστεύσαντες λέγειν ἀληθέα*

(cp. λόγιμος μοῦνος *infra*). That certainly makes a more forcible and consequent clause; but it is difficult to account for such a corruption, the MSS. showing practically no trace of it; and we must remember that Hdt. is not always as consequent or forcible in his thought, expressions, and grammar, as he might have been. Perhaps Hdt. wrote λόγῳ.

2. **Ἑλλησποντίων.** The term here includes all from the Chersonese to Byzantion, cp. c. 85 *supra*.

8. **Αἰολέων.** No Dorians: the Dorians are blameless. (Not so thirty years later, 7. 93.)

139. 5. **πειρῴατο.** With this form cp. ἀνιῴατο c. 130.

καὶ . . γέφυραν *seclusit* Stein. The words involve a material *non sequitur*.

13. **ἐλεύθεροι.** The Scythians not being republicans did not realise the incompatibility of freedom and monarchy. The ἐλευθερία here is only freedom from the *foreign* despot; to a Greek, however, it meant republicanism, cp. 7. 104. In the mouth of Histiaios it was, if not an absurdity, at least a satire.

140. 1. **Σκύθαι.** The whole forces under the three kings, with their allies, are present on this occasion. As the more impressive demonstration, and in fact the climax of the narrative, the author has shown his art in enlarging at this point upon the Scythian offer: but surely debate and discussion, if there ever was any on the question, must have taken place on the first occasion, where nothing of the kind is hinted, Miltiades and everybody remaining silent, c. 133 *supra ad fin.* . . . (A somewhat similar situation is shown in the unreported and reported councils at Salamis: 8. 56, 59 ff.)

Ἴωσι πιστεύσαντες. The (Doric) author seems to think the Scyths rather simple to believe Ionians, at least after one breach of faith. Cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.

ὑπέστρεφον ἐπὶ ζήτησιν τῶν Περσέων, καὶ ἡμάρτανον πάσης τῆς
ἐκείνων διεξόδου. αἴτιοι δὲ τούτου αὐτοὶ οἱ Σκύθαι ἐγένοντο,
τὰς νομὰς τῶν ἵππων τὰς ταύτῃ διαφθείραντες καὶ τὰ ὕδατα
συγχώσαντες. εἰ γὰρ ταῦτα μὴ ἐποίησαν, παρεῖχε ἄν σφι, εἰ
ἐβούλοντο, εὐπετέως ἐξευρεῖν τοὺς Πέρσας. νῦν δὲ τά σφι
ἐδόκεε ἄριστα βεβουλεῦσθαι, κατὰ ταῦτα ἐσφάλησαν. Σκύθαι
μέν νυν τῆς σφετέρης χώρης τῇ χιλός τε τοῖσι ἵπποισι καὶ ὕδατα
ἦν, ταύτῃ διεξιόντες ἐδίζηντο τοὺς ἀντιπολεμίους, δοκέοντες καὶ
ἐκείνους διὰ τοιούτων τὴν ἀπόδρησιν ποιέεσθαι· οἱ δὲ δὴ Πέρσαι
τὸν πρότερον ἑωυτῶν γενόμενον στίβον, τοῦτον φυλάσσοντες
ἤισαν, καὶ οὕτω μόγις εὗρον τὸν πόρον. οἷα δὲ νυκτός τε ἀπικό-
μενοι καὶ λελυμένης τῆς γεφύρης ἐντυχόντες, ἐς πᾶσαν ἀρρωδίην
ἀπίκοντο μή σφεας οἱ Ἴωνες ἔωσι ἀπολελοιπότες. ἦν δὲ περὶ 141
Δαρεῖον ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος φωνέων μέγιστον ἀνθρώπων· τοῦτον
τὸν ἄνδρα καταστάντα ἐπὶ τοῦ χείλεος τοῦ Ἴστρου ἐκέλευε
Δαρεῖος καλέειν Ἱστιαῖον Μιλήσιον. ὁ μὲν δὴ ἐποίεε ταῦτα,
Ἱστιαῖος δὲ ἐπακούσας τῷ πρώτῳ κελεύσματι τάς τε νέας ἁπάσας
παρεῖχε διαπορθμεύειν τὴν στρατιὴν καὶ τὴν γέφυραν ἔζευξε.
Πέρσαι μὲν ὦν οὕτω ἐκφεύγουσι. Σκύθαι δὲ διζήμενοι καὶ τὸ 142
δεύτερον ἥμαρτον τῶν Περσέων, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ὡς ἐόντας Ἴωνας
ἐλευθέρους κακίστους τε καὶ ἀνανδροτάτους κρίνουσι εἶναι ἁπάν-

---

4. **τὰ ὕδατα.** Cp. c. 120 *supra*. The adverse criticism on the Scyths is necessarily unjust, the supposed facts of the case being impossible, but the dramatic situation and moral are charming, and have presumably helped the production of the story. Anyway the Ionians alone were not to blame for the escape of the Persians: a Greek strategist would have managed things better (cp. cc. 46, 95 *supra*, Introduction, pp. lxvi. ff., cxvi.).

11. **τὸν πρότερον κτλ.** This is an inconsequence. According to the story the Persians left the Danube and followed the one division of Scyths eastward and across the Tanais, returned along the north side of Scythia as far as the frontier of the Agathyrsi (the Carpathians) and now retreating due south (or even from the north-west), they come back on the same track as they had made going east (or north-east). If Dareios returned by the way by which he had gone, he did not go eastward: if he went eastward he did not return by the same way: at least if he went to the Carpathians, after all the most probable *terminus ad quem*. See Appendix III. § 16.

141. 1. **ἦν δὲ περὶ Δαρεῖον κτλ.** Are there many finer situations in historic literature than this? The fate of the King of Kings, and of the flying remnants of the Asiatic host trembling in the balance; vengeance behind, the impassable river in front, the great cry of the Egyptian rending the night: and the wakeful Milesian, on the watch for his Lord; no need to call him twice!

2. **φωνέων . . καλέειν.** Generic, specific. Men with loud voices were much esteemed in antiquity: Artachaees the Persian, who thirty years afterwards had the loudest voice in the world, was worshipped by the Akanthians 7. 117. One misses the name of this Egyptian Stentor. He was perhaps of the class of Interpreters, 2. 154.

3. **χείλεος.** If such metaphorical words were to be pressed, the anatomy of the Danube, Hellespont, etc. would become very puzzling. Cp. c. 85 *supra*.

142. 3. **κρίνουσι.** For this literary device of making the intelligent foreigner a mouthpiece for home truths, see cc.

των ἀνθρώπων, τοῦτο δέ, ὡς δούλων ἐόντων τὸν λόγον ποιεύμενοι, ἀνδράποδα φιλοδέσποτά φασι εἶναι καὶ ἄδρηστα μάλιστα. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ Σκύθησι ἐς Ἴωνας ἀπέρριπται.

143 Δαρεῖος δὲ διὰ τῆς Θρηίκης πορευόμενος ἀπίκετο ἐς Σηστὸν τῆς Χερσονήσου· ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν διέβη τῇσι νηυσὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, λείπει δὲ στρατηγὸν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ Μεγάβαζον ἄνδρα Πέρσην· τῷ Δαρεῖός κοτε ἔδωκε γέρας, τοιόνδε εἴπας ἐν Πέρσῃσι ἔπος. ὁρμημένου Δαρείου ῥοιὰς τρώγειν, ὡς ἄνοιξε τάχιστα τὴν πρώτην τῶν ῥοιέων, εἴρετο αὐτὸν ὁ ἀδελφεὸς Ἀρτάβανος ὅ τι βούλοιτ' ἄν οἱ τοσοῦτο πλῆθος γενέσθαι ὅσοι ἐν τῇ ῥοιῇ κόκκοι· Δαρεῖος δὲ εἶπε Μεγαβάζους ἄν οἱ τοσούτους ἀριθμὸν γενέσθαι βούλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὑπήκοον. ἐν μὲν δὴ Πέρσῃσι ταῦτά μιν εἴπας ἐτίμα, τότε δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπέλιπε στρατηγὸν ἔχοντα
144 τῆς στρατιῆς τῆς ἑωυτοῦ ὀκτὼ μυριάδας. οὗτος δὲ ὁ Μεγάβαζος εἴπας τόδε τὸ ἔπος ἐλίπετο ἀθάνατον μνήμην πρὸς Ἑλλησποντίων.

---

77 *supra*, 144 *infra*. The remark may have been current in Sparta: at least it has a Doric ring. But the sneer was singularly unjust, as the Ionic revolts proved. What is not found in Hdt. is the story of the surrender of the Asiatic Dorians to the Persian.

5. **ἄδρηστα μάλιστα**, 'least given to running away from their masters.' Stein's *editio minor* drops μάλιστα. "Operarum errore" van Herwerden.

6. **Σκύθησι.** There is perhaps some humour in putting this taunt into the mouth of the very men who have just before been themselves taunted as runaways, c. 126 *supra*. But they were masters of the art (c. 46 *supra*), as indeed the whole campaign showed. Scythian slaves were not unknown in Greece: but there seems no consciousness of their presence in the narrative.

143. 1. **διὰ τῆς Θρηίκης.** Why Dareios who had retraced his track to the Danube struck out a fresh way through Thrace, neither Hdt. nor his sources here reveal. The reason perhaps was that the bridge over the Bosporos had been destroyed (cp. Ktesias, *Persica*, 17, ed. Gilmore, p. 151), and Byzantion and Chalkedon were in revolt, together with other of the 'Hellespontine' towns. Cp. 5. 26 *infra*. Stein argues from 6. 40 that the Scyths pursued the king as far as the Hellespont: see note *ad l.c.*

Σηστός would be under the authority of Miltiades, whose loyalty to the Persian cause was presumably unquestioned. Cp. c. 137 *supra*.

3. **Μεγάβαζον**, 5. 1 *infra*. Hdt. in accordance with one of his methods closes the record, or marks a pause, by introducing these biographical Ana.

4. **κοτε.** Whether before or after this commission does not appear: but ἐν Πέρσῃσι ("before all the Persians," Rawlinson; better, "in the land of Persia," Macaulay) would at least suggest that it was not on this occasion.

9. **τὴν Ἑλλάδα** betrays the Greek provenance of this anecdote: probably from the same source as the next: viz. Byzantion (Ἑλλησποντίων next c.)—80,000 men, a respectable *corps d'armée* to be in fighting trim after the Scythian fiasco! 80,000 is the figure at which Ktesias, *Pers.* 17, and Trogus Pomp. (Justin. 2. 5) put the king's losses in Europe.

144. 2. **ἀθάνατον μνήμην.** Could anything indicate more strikingly Hdt.'s passion for a *bon mot*? One would suppose that the subsequent operations of Megabazos in Thrace (5. 1 ff.) might have contributed to keep his name in remembrance. The Persian must have made this remark on the way to Scythia, as Byzantion was not recovered by him but by his successor Otanes 5. 26 *infra*. The *bon mot* was afterwards appropriated by the Delphic oracle (for one cannot suppose that Hdt. would have transferred an immortal witticism from the god to a barbarian): Strabo, 320.

γενόμενος γὰρ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ ἐπύθετο ἑπτακαίδεκα ἔτεσι πρότερον Καλχηδονίους κτίσαντας τὴν χώρην Βυζαντίων, πυθόμενος δὲ ἔφη Καλχηδονίους τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον τυγχάνειν ἐόντας τυφλούς· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τοῦ καλλίονος παρεόντος κτίζειν χώρου τὸν αἰσχίονα ἑλέσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἦσαν τυφλοί. οὗτος δὴ ὦν τότε ὁ Μεγάβαζος στρατηγὸς λειφθεὶς ἐν τῇ χώρῃ Ἑλλησποντίων τοὺς μὴ μηδίζοντας κατεστρέφετο.

Οὗτος μέν νυν ταῦτα ἔπρησσε. τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦτον χρόνον 145
ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ Λιβύην ἄλλος στρατιῆς μέγας στόλος, διὰ πρόφασιν τὴν ἐγὼ ἀπηγήσομαι προδιηγησάμενος πρότερον τάδε. τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀργοῦς ἐπιβατέων παίδων παῖδες ἐξελασθέντες ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν τῶν ἐκ Βραυρῶνος ληισαμένων τὰς Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας, ὑπὸ τούτων ἐξελασθέντες ἐκ Λήμνου οἴχοντο πλέοντες ἐς Λακεδαίμονα, ἱζόμενοι δὲ ἐν τῷ Τηϋγέτῳ πῦρ ἀνέκαιον. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἰδόντες ἄγγελον ἔπεμπον πευσόμενοι τίνες τε

---

145. 1. **τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ χρόνον.** These words open the *Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι* referred to 2. 161.

Artificial synchronisms are part of the machinery of Hdt.'s history, cp. 7. 166, 9. 101, and Introduction, § 9.

2. **ἐπὶ Λιβύην.** The subsequent narrative makes this view appear a great exaggeration of the objects of this expedition: but cp. Append. XII. The exaggeration is, in any case, necessary to keep up the parallel with the Scythic expedition, and to justify the geographical and ethnographical excursus on Libya. Cp. Introduction, p. xxxii.

πρόφασιν. Cp. c. 135 *supra*.

3. **προδιηγησάμενος.** The relation of this *προδιήγησις* to the narrative, its sources and significance, are discussed in Appendix XII.

4. **ἐκ τῆς Ἀργοῦς.** Cp. 7. 193. In 1. 2 it is simply called a *νηεὺς μακρή*. In Apollodoros, *Biblioth.* 1. 9, 16 *πεντηκόντορος ναῦς*. The ancients amused themselves with making lists of the Argonautae, fifty or so; a comparison of these lists gives twenty-eight constant names (K. Seeliger, in Roscher's *Lexikon*, p. 508). Hdt. names Jason c. 179 *infra*, Herakles 7. 193, the Tyndaridae (here).

4. **ἐπιβατέων** must not be pressed here, though in 6. 12 *et al.* it is contrasted with *ναῦται*. Hdt. would have agreed, in those days, *αὐτερέται δὲ ὅτι ἦσαν καὶ μάχιμοι πάντες* Thuc. 1. 10.

παίδων παῖδες. Not to be taken literally: just below they call themselves *παῖδες ἡρώων*. Cp. Pindar, *Nem.* 7. 147 *παίδων δὲ παῖδες ἔχοιεν αἰεὶ γέρας τό περ νῦν καὶ ἄρειον ὄπιθεν.* Add *Il.* 20. 308. Hdt. 1. 2 puts the voyage one generation before the Trojan war. Here he conceives the 'sons' sons' of the Argonauts as coming to Sparta after the Dorian conquest and Return of the Herakleidae, just in fact at the majority of the Twins.

Hekataios had dealt with the saga of the Argonauts if the Schol. on Apollon. Rhod. be trusted. Hdt. may have him in view here, cp. Hecataei Frag. 187. (Müller, *F. H. G.* i. 13[a].)

5. **τῶν ἐκ Βραυρῶνος.** Cp. 6. 137 *infra*. The words *τῶν . . ἐξελασθέντες* are not unlike a gloss. Van Herwerden amends by inserting *δὴ* after *τούτων*.

7. **ἐν τῷ Τηϋγέτῳ,** *sc. ὄρει*. It was not necessary that Hdt. should specify that Taygetos was a mountain, but it is not obvious on what point or part of Taygetos the fire is to be located. The highest summit of the mountain, anc. Taleton, mod. St. Elias (7902 ft.), is above Sparta: oddly enough the district between Taleton and Evoras (Mount Paximádhi, the highest summit next to St. Elias) was called Theras. Taleton (St. Elias, still the scene of an annual pilgrimage) was sacred to the Sun. Pausan. 3. 20, 5. Cp. Smith, *Dict. Geogr. sub v.* LACONIA.

καὶ ὀκόθεν εἰσί· οἱ δὲ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ εἰρωτῶντι ἔλεγον ὡς εἴησαν μὲν Μινύαι, παῖδες δὲ εἶεν τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ πλεόντων ἡρώων, προσσχόντας δὲ τούτους ἐς Λῆμνον φυτεῦσαί σφεας. οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀκηκοότες τὸν λόγον τῆς γενεῆς τῶν Μινυέων, πέμψαντες τὸ δεύτερον εἰρώτων τί θέλοντες ἥκοιέν τε ἐς τὴν χώρην καὶ πῦρ αἴθοιεν. οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν ἐκβληθέντες ἥκειν ἐς τοὺς πατέρας· δικαιότατον γὰρ εἶναι οὕτω τοῦτο γίνεσθαι· δέεσθαι δὲ οἰκέειν ἅμα τούτοισι μοῖράν τε τιμέων μετέχοντες καὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπολαχόντες. Λακεδαιμονίοισι δὲ ἕαδε δέκεσθαι τοὺς Μινύας ἐπ' οἷσι θέλουσι αὐτοί. μάλιστα δὲ ἐνῆγέ σφεας ὥστε ποιέειν ταῦτα τῶν Τυνδαριδέων ἡ ναυτιλίη ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ. δεξάμενοι δὲ τοὺς Μινύας γῆς τε μετέδοσαν καὶ ἐς φυλὰς διεδάσαντο. οἱ δὲ αὐτίκα μὲν γάμους ἔγημαν, τὰς δὲ ἐκ
146 *Λήμνου ἤγοντο ἐξέδοσαν ἄλλοισι. χρόνου δὲ οὐ πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος αὐτίκα οἱ Μινύαι ἐξύβρισαν, τῆς τε βασιληίης μεταιτέοντες καὶ ἄλλα ποιέοντες οὐκ ὅσια. τοῖσι ὦν Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἔδοξε αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι, συλλαβόντες δέ σφεας κατέβαλον ἐς ἑρκτήν. κτείνουσι δὲ τοὺς ἂν κτείνωσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι νυκτός,*

---

9. **ἔλεγον.** Speaking Greek of course; so that in their case the mother tongue had not prevailed? But Hdt. does not think of these things. Cp. c. 133 *supra.*

15. **δικαιότατον.** They had a just claim on their fathers, though **πατέρας** is rather straining a point.

They fail to answer the part of the question referring to the fire. Blakesley regards it as "a symbol of the Hephaistos-worship brought from the volcanic island of Lemnos." But not by immigrants after the Dorian invasion, surely: besides, one might light a fire on Taygeton without wanting to worship it. Was it, however, connected with the Sun-worship (see above)? The sense of any such connexion has obviously disappeared in the story as told by Hdt.

17. **Λακεδαιμονίοισι.** This passage has been gravely quoted as an exception to the rule of Spartan citizenship stated 9. 35, as though these Minyae in the Peloponnese had really immigrated and been admitted into the Spartan (Dorian) franchise! For a similar case at Athens cp. 5. 57. It is, however, far from certain that Spartan *civitas* was restricted to pure Dorians.

19. **τῶν Τυνδαριδέων ἡ ναυτιλίη.** The motive here cannot be historical, but the statement none the less illustrates a kind of appeal that was popular with Hellenic audiences even long after Hdt.'s day; specially when there were sound reasons for the line of action demanded on mythological precedents or principles. Or sometimes the myth served as an excuse for inaction. For instances cp. 5. 43, 79, 94, 6. 137 ff., 7. 159, 9. 26, 27. Their relationship with the Tyndaridae would not have given the Minyae a lien on Dorian land, or women, except so far as the Dorian conquerors had adopted Minyan traditions and institutions.

21. **φυλάς.** As they were given Dorian wives (according to the saga) the word might include the Dorian tribes.

τὰς δέ. Not their wives but their sisters? The passage is interesting as showing that these early refugees were not always thought of as voyaging without women (cp. 1. 146): and also as further evidence of the mixed descent of Spartan citizens. Cp. c. 149 *infra.*

146. 3. **καὶ ἄλλα.** One would at least like to know the other charges against them: specially if connected with cult and worship (cp. 5. 72, 6. 81). It was just in the kingship at Sparta that the non-Dorian element was nominally represented. See 5. 72 *infra.*

5. **κτείνουσι.** Nicolas of Damascus is the (weak) authority for the state-

μετ᾽ ἡμέρην δὲ οὐδένα. ἐπεὶ ὦν ἔμελλόν σφεας καταχρήσασθαι, παραιτήσαντο αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Μινυέων, ἐοῦσαι ἀσταί τε καὶ τῶν πρώτων Σπαρτιητέων θυγατέρες, ἐσελθεῖν τε ἐς τὴν ἑρκτὴν καὶ ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν ἑκάστη τῷ ἑωυτῆς ἀνδρί. οἱ δέ σφεας παρῆκαν, οὐδένα δόλον δοκέοντες ἐξ αὐτέων ἔσεσθαι. αἱ δὲ ἐπείτε ἐσῆλθον, ποιέουσι τοιάδε· πᾶσαν τὴν εἶχον ἐσθῆτα παραδοῦσαι τοῖσι ἀνδράσι αὐταὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔλαβον, οἱ δὲ Μινύαι ἐνδύντες τὴν γυναικηίην ἐσθῆτα ἅτε γυναῖκες ἐξήισαν ἔξω, ἐκφυγόντες δὲ τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ἵζοντο αὖτις ἐς τὸ Τηΰγετον.

Τὸν δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦτον χρόνον Θήρας ὁ Αὐτεσίωνος τοῦ Τισα- 147
μενοῦ τοῦ Θερσάνδρου τοῦ Πολυνείκεος ἔστελλε ἐς ἀποικίην ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος. ἦν δὲ ὁ Θήρας οὗτος, γένος ἐὼν Καδμεῖος, τῆς μητρὸς ἀδελφεὸς τοῖσι Ἀριστοδήμου παισὶ Εὐρυσθένεϊ καὶ Προκλέϊ. ἐόντων δὲ ἔτι τῶν παίδων τούτων νηπίων ἐπιτροπαίην

---

ment that the possession of gold or silver was punished with death. Cp. Stobaeus, 44. 40, K. F. Hermann, *Gr. Staatsalt.* i.[5] p. 141, § 27, n. 10. The supreme penalty was (we may assume) rarely if ever enforced against Spartiatae. Hdt.'s remark in its own way illustrates τὸ κρυπτὸν τῆς πολιτείας. It furnishes also a suggestive example of the necessity of reading a general statement in the light of its context: divorced therefrom, this statement would be absurd. Whether the statement is taken over by Hdt. from his source, or inserted by him *proprio motu*, is a curious point, cp. Introduction, p. lvii.

7. **ἀσταὶ . . θυγατέρες.** The words imply *prima facie* that the women were Dorians, the πρωτεῖα, some difference of rank among the Spartiatae.

9. **ἑκάστη . . ἀνδρί.** Strict monogamy is implied (cp. 5. 40). K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos*,[2] p. 307, believing that the Minyae were immigrants, discredits the saga here told, by pointing out that *connubium* between Spartans and strangers was impossible. But the *connubium* is just one of the most significant traits in the saga, one of the data, so to speak, which the saga undertakes to explain; a fact which, however, may be thought to prove that the Minyae were not immigrants admitted to Dorian franchise, but part of the prae-Dorian population. Cp. c. 149 *infra*. The conduct of these Spartan (Dorian) wives is a splendid contrast to the σχέτλιον ἔργον of the Lemnian women τὸ ἐργάσαντο αἱ γυναῖκες τοὺς ἅμα Θόαντι ἄνδρας σφετέρους ἀποκτείνασαι, 6. 138 *infra*, where see note. Plutarch, *de Virt. Mulier.* viii. (*Mor.* 247), gives a tradition differing in many particulars from the Herodotean, but betraying similar motives and results.

147. 2. **ἔστελλε ἐς ἀποικίην.** Ostensibly an independent and fortunate coincidence; historically, perhaps, a transfigured reminiscence of the discontent of the prae-Dorian inhabitants with the new situation.

3. **τῆς μητρὸς ἀδελφεός.** Theras stood in the relation of *Avunculus* to the fatherless family. The importance of the mother's brother, which is, of course, not adequately explained by the death of Aristodemos, points to a matriarchal society: cp. Bachofen, *Antiquarische Briefe*, xix. xlvii. ff. When K. O. Müller, *Orchom.*[2] p. 330, says that the relation in which Theras is put to the Herakleid kings is *reine Dichtung des Dorischen Nationalepos* (pure imagination in the Dorian national epos), we must qualify the term *rein* (pure) by remembering that the epos will have imitated real situations, claims, and customs; and the term *Nationalepos*, by remembering that the Dorians had none of their own, but accepted the non-Dorian, and made the best of it, from their own point of view.

εἶχε ὁ Θήρας τὴν ἐν Σπάρτῃ βασιληίην. αὐξηθέντων δὲ τῶν ἀδελφιδέων καὶ παραλαβόντων τὴν ἀρχήν, οὕτω δὴ ὁ Θήρας δεινὸν ποιεύμενος ἄρχεσθαι ὑπ' ἄλλων ἐπείτε ἐγεύσατο ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ἔφη μένειν ἐν τῇ Λακεδαίμονι ἀλλ' ἀποπλεύσεσθαι ἐς τοὺς συγγενέας. ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ νῦν Θήρῃ καλεομένῃ νήσῳ, πρότερον δὲ Καλλίστῃ τῇ αὐτῇ ταύτῃ, ἀπόγονοι Μεμβλιάρου τοῦ Ποικίλεω ἀνδρὸς Φοίνικος. Κάδμος γὰρ ὁ Ἀγήνορος Εὐρώπην διζήμενος προσέσχε ἐς τὴν νῦν Θήρην καλεομένην· προσσχόντι δὲ εἴτε δή οἱ ἡ χώρη ἤρεσε, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλως ἠθέλησε ποιῆσαι τοῦτο· καταλείπει γὰρ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ταύτῃ ἄλλους τε τῶν Φοινίκων καὶ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἑωυτοῦ συγγενέων Μεμβλίαρον. οὗτοι ἐνέμοντο τὴν Καλλίστην καλεομένην ἐπὶ γενεάς, πρὶν ἢ Θήραν ἐλθεῖν ἐκ
148 Λακεδαίμονος, ὀκτὼ ἀνδρῶν. ἐπὶ τούτους δὴ ὦν ὁ Θήρας λεὼν ἔχων ἀπὸ τῶν φυλέων ἔστελλε, συνοικήσων τούτοισι καὶ οὐδαμῶς

---

10. **τῇ νῦν Θήρῃ κ.** What remains of it is *now* called Santorin: see H. F. Tozer, *Islands of the Aegean*, c. v.; Theodore Bent, *The Cyclades*, c. vi.; though there is a tendency to revive the ancient name.

11. **Καλλίστῃ.** Mr. Bent (*op. c.* p. 114) describes this volcanic island as "hideous" but "fascinating in its hideousness." Mr. Tozer (*op. c.* p. 108) suggests that the old name was "a euphemistic expression," but adds that the vineyards and the harbour of the island might supply an explanation. The utilitarian seems more probable than the aesthetic reason. Cp. c. 157 *infra*.

16. **συγγενέων.** It was a similar motive which had guided the Minyae to Sparta: c. 145 *supra*.

Μεμβλίαρον. There is an island of this name near Thera. Prehistoric remains, buried under volcanic matter, in Thera and Therasia attest the antiquity of its occupation: in Hdt.'s time the memory of the eruption which had overwhelmed them, and which may be dated even before Kadmos, had apparently been forgotten. Cp. Fouqué, *Santorin et ses éruptions*, Paris 1879.

18. **ὀκτὼ ἀνδρῶν.** K. O. Müller, *Orchom.*[2] p. 319, makes out nine: 1 Kadmos, 2 Polydoros, 3 Labdakos, 4 Laios (see Hdt. 5. 59), 5 Oedipus (Hdt. 5. 60), 6 Polyneikes, 7 Thersandros, 8 Tisamenos, 9 Autesion, 10 Theras. Stein follows him. Nine generations would be just 300 years. Rawlinson *ad l.* defends the discrepancy by observing that there might be ten (nine) generations at Thebes and only eight at Kalliste-Thera. This would be odd, Hdt.'s allowance being three generations to the century (2. 142): but it is possible that there is the frequent confusion of *reigns* and *generations* at the bottom of the anomaly, and it may be observed that there were eight Battiadae in Kyrene, Thera's colony, covering a period of less than two centuries, 632-460 B.C. Cp. c. 163 *infra*.

148. 2. **φυλέων.** Rawlinson remarks: "The three old Dorian tribes, Hyllaei, Dymanes, and Pamphyles, must here be meant": of that there can be little doubt. But whether this meaning is according to facts, or consistent with the context, are further questions. Is it conceivable that the Dorian element in Sparta was thus weakened in the presence of hostile Minyae, Arcadians, etc. by a levy for a colony, long before the Dorians had really made themselves masters of Laconia?—To say nothing of their taking refuge together with the Lemnians, with whom they have just been quarrelling, under a discontented Kadmeian, and expecting a welcome in a Phoenician island! Of course when Hdt. is writing, Thera passes for a Dorian settlement, and Dorian Sparta for its metropolis; and no doubt the φυλαὶ here mentioned are *ex hypothesi* the Dorian tribes: but the statement is *pragmatic*, a part of the Dorian (Spartan) claim to Thera.

ἐξελὼν αὐτοὺς ἀλλὰ κάρτα οἰκηιεύμενος. ἐπείτε δὲ καὶ οἱ Μινύαι ἐκδράντες ἐκ τῆς ἑρκτῆς ἵζοντο ἐς τὸ Τηΰγετον, τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων βουλευομένων σφέας ἀπολλύναι παραιτέεται ὁ Θήρας, ὅκως μήτε φόνος γένηται, αὐτός τε ὑπεδέκετό σφεας ἐξάξειν ἐκ τῆς χώρης. συγχωρησάντων δὲ τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, τρισὶ τριηκοντέροισι ἐς τοὺς Μεμβλιάρου ἀπογόνους ἔπλωσε, οὔτι πάντας ἄγων τοὺς Μινύας ἀλλ' ὀλίγους τινάς. οἱ γὰρ πλεῦνες αὐτῶν ἐτράποντο ἐς τοὺς Παρωρεάτας καὶ Καύκωνας, τούτους δὲ ἐξελάσαντες ἐκ τῆς χώρης σφέας αὐτοὺς ἓξ μοίρας διεῖλον, καὶ ἔπειτα ἔκτισαν πόλιας τάσδε ἐν αὐτοῖσι, Λέπρεον Μάκιστον Φρίξας Πύργον Ἔπιον Νούδιον. τουτέων δὲ τὰς πλεῦνας ἐπ' ἐμέο Ἠλεῖοι ἐπόρθησαν. τῇ δὲ
νήσῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκιστέω Θήρα ἡ ἐπωνυμίη ἐγένετο. ὁ δὲ παῖς 149
οὐ γὰρ ἔφη οἱ συμπλεύσεσθαι, τοιγαρῶν ἔφη αὐτὸν καταλείψειν ὄιν ἐν λύκοισι. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔπεος τούτου οὔνομα τῷ νεηνίσκῳ τούτῳ Οἰόλυκος ἐγένετο, καί κως τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο ἐπεκράτησε. Οἰολύκου δὲ γίνεται Αἰγεύς, ἐπ' οὗ Αἰγεῖδαι καλέονται φυλὴ μεγάλη

---

8. **τρισὶ τριηκοντέροισι.** Three triekonters would not have held many men, even if room be made for a few passengers: Theras takes ὀλίγους τινας. Even so, there is little space for the λεὼς ἀπὸ τῶν φυλέων.

The Minyae in the Peloponnese, *i.e.* the representatives of a culture which had been traced in Boeotia, Lemnos, Thera, and other islands, were perhaps descendants of immigrants, in regard to whom it was perceived that they did not constitute the most primitive and subordinate stratum in the population (Kaukones, Paroreatae), while they were equally distinct from the Dorians.

13. **Λέπρεον κτλ.** These citylets formed the Triphylian Hexapolis. Cp. Busolt, *Die Lakedaimonier*, i. pp. 149 ff. who notices that they composed a sort of Amphictyony, the centre of which was the sanctuary of 'the Samian Poseidon,' in charge of the Makistii. Strabo, 343. Cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 240.

14. **ἐπ' ἐμέο.** A lamentably vague date. The small local business on the W. of Peloponnese here recorded would hardly have obtained special notice if it had been an old story at the time of Hdt.'s visit to Sparta where he perhaps heard about it: the Spartans concealing any part they themselves had in the matter. Stein would date it 460 B.C. after the third Messenian war (assumed to have lasted not ten but only four years: Thuc. 1. 103). It was surely not unconnected with the Synoekism of Elis, and the establishment of the Eleian democracy about the year 472 B.C. (cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* ii. 371 ff.): and certainly marks a moment when Spartan influence and power were depressed. Cp. Introduction, p. lxiv.

149. 5. **Αἰγεῖδαι.** There were Aigeidae in Thebes, in Kyrene, in Thera, in Akragas, as well as in Sparta, all professing to be hereditary priests of Karneian Apollo (*Orchom.*[2] p. 321): yet according to Hdt. the name was derived from Aigeus son of Oiolykos son of Theras. This is the local Spartan version (Pausan. 3. 15, 8) and at variance with the tradition in Pindar, *Isth.* 6. (7.) 15 (not himself a member of the clan, *Pyth.* 5. 75 notwithstanding: *vide* F. Studniczka, *Kyrene*, pp. 73 ff.), and with Hdt.'s own record of Aigeidae in Thera. Blakesley, from overlooking this latent contradiction, wants to relegate τὠυτὸ . . γεγονόσι to the margin as a gloss.

φυλὴ is used inexactly: φρατρία would probably have been a better word: the addition of μεγάλη shows that Hdt. is not using φυλὴ in the technical sense (*Orchom.*[2] p. 323 n.).

ἐν Σπάρτῃ. τοῖσι δὲ ἐν τῇ φυλῇ ταύτῃ ἀνδράσι οὐ γὰρ ὑπέμειναν τὰ τέκνα, ἱδρύσαντο ἐκ θεοπροπίου Ἐρινύων τῶν Λαΐου τε καὶ Οἰδιπόδεω ἱρόν· καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὑπέμειναν . . . . τὠυτὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν Θήρῃ τοῖσι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων γεγονόσι.

150 *Μέχρι μέν νυν τούτου τοῦ λόγου Λακεδαιμόνιοι Θηραίοισι κατὰ ταὐτὰ λέγουσι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου μοῦνοι Θηραῖοι ὧδε γενέσθαι λέγουσι. Γρῖννος ὁ Αἰσανίου ἐὼν Θήρα τούτου ἀπόγονος καὶ βασιλεύων Θήρης τῆς νήσου ἀπίκετο ἐς Δελφούς, ἄγων ἀπὸ τῆς πόλιος ἑκατόμβην· εἵποντο δέ οἱ καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν πολιητέων καὶ δὴ καὶ Βάττος ὁ Πολυμνήστου, ἐὼν γένος Εὐφημίδης τῶν Μινυέων. χρεωμένῳ δὲ τῷ Γρίννῳ τῷ βασιλέι τῶν Θηραίων περὶ ἄλλων χρᾷ ἡ Πυθίη κτίζειν ἐν Λιβύῃ πόλιν. ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων "ἐγὼ μὲν ὦναξ πρεσβύτερός τε ἤδη εἰμὶ καὶ βαρὺς ἀείρεσθαι· σὺ δέ τινα τῶνδε τῶν νεωτέρων κέλευε ταῦτα ποιέειν." ἅμα τε ἔλεγε ταῦτα καὶ ἐδείκνυε ἐς τὸν Βάττον. τότε μὲν τοσαῦτα. μετὰ δὲ ἀπελθόντες ἀλογίην εἶχον τοῦ χρηστηρίου, οὔτε Λιβύην εἰδότες ὅκου γῆς εἴη οὔτε τολμῶντες ἐς ἀφανὲς χρῆμα ἀποστέλλειν*

---

6. **ἐν Σπάρτῃ.** Pindar, who perhaps is following the local Kyrenaean tradition, makes the Aigeidae accompany the Herakleidae into Lacedaemon. This according to K. O. Müller (*op. c.* p. 325) is *grundfalsch*. According to Müller's reconstruction, the Aigeidae came into Lakonia a generation before the Dorians: on the invasion of the latter they took refuge with Achaeans and Minyans in Amyklae, entered into special relations with the Herakleids, and after the conquest of Amyklae became a (Dorian) phratry in Sparta. The 'Minyan' colonisation of Thera he places before the Dorian invasion (pp. 327, 8).

8. **τὠυτό.** Stein suggests *συνέβη δὲ τὠυτό*, Cobet *συνήνεικε δὲ* which Holder puts into his text.

150. 1. **μέχρι μέν.** A possible discrepancy has been indicated between Spartan and Theraean versions in note to l. 5, previous chapter.

2. **μοῦνοι.** The Lakedaemonians having no story on the subject, and the Kyrenaeans a different one c. 154. There is even now nothing to prove that Hdt. heard this version *in* Thera, or even from Theraeans at first hand: he would give it in the same way (Blakesley points out) if he had heard it from a Samian, who professed to have heard it in Thera, or from Theraeans. Nay, he might give it, on grounds of internal evidence, or of external authority, as the Theraean story, no matter how he came by it. (Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxvii. ff.) Cobet omits *Θήρης*.

3. **Γρῖννος.** The name, with one *ν*, is found in a (late) Theraean inscription (the will of Epikteta), *C.I.G.* 2448. Cauer, *Delectus*², No. 148.

6. **Εὐφημίδης** is an emendation borrowed (by Palmer) from Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 455. The MSS. have *Εὐθυμίδης* (one *Εὐθυμήδης*). Blakesley protests against the alteration. K. O. M. calls it: "Palmerius' unbestreitbare Emendation" (*Orchom.*² p. 335 n.). The emendation may be incorrect in the sense that Hdt. made a slip (through oblivion or ignorance) and wrote *Εὐθυμίδης*. He does not appear to know Pindar's ode, cp. c. 154 *infra*. But that he ought to have written *Εὐφημίδης* is beyond question.

When the Theraeans in the days of Grinnos and Battos (Ol. 35, K. O. Müller) are represented as knowing nothing of Libya, Hdt. must, as Blakesley remarks, be following a different tradition from that which led him in 2. 50 to derive Poseidon from Libya. That indeed would be manifest without the contradiction: what this proves is how little Hdt. concerned himself to eliminate inconsequences and inconsistencies from his work as a whole. Cp. c. 152 *infra*.

ἀποικίην. ἑπτὰ δὲ ἐτέων μετὰ ταῦτα οὐκ ὗε τὴν Θήρην, ἐν 151
τοῖσι τὰ δένδρεα πάντα σφι τὰ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πλὴν ἑνὸς ἐξαυάνθη. χρεωμένοισι δὲ τοῖσι Θηραίοισι προέφερε ἡ Πυθίη τὴν ἐς Λιβύην ἀποικίην. ἐπείτε δὲ κακοῦ οὐδὲν ἦν σφι μῆχος, πέμπουσι ἐς Κρήτην ἀγγέλους διζημένους εἴ τις Κρητῶν ἢ μετοίκων ἀπιγμένος εἴη ἐς Λιβύην. περιπλανώμενοι δὲ αὐτὴν οὗτοι ἀπίκοντο καὶ ἐς Ἴτανον πόλιν, ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ συμμίσγουσι ἀνδρὶ πορφυρέι τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Κορώβιος, ὃς ἔφη ὑπ᾽ ἀνέμων ἀπενειχθεὶς ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Λιβύην καὶ Λιβύης ἐς Πλατέαν νῆσον. μισθῷ δὲ τοῦτον πείσαντες ἦγον ἐς Θήρην, ἐκ δὲ Θήρης ἔπλεον κατάσκοποι ἄνδρες τὰ πρῶτα οὐ πολλοί· κατηγησαμένου δὲ τοῦ Κορωβίου ἐς τὴν νῆσον ταύτην δὴ τὴν Πλατέαν, τὸν μὲν Κορώβιον λείπουσι, σιτία κατα-

---

151. 1. **ἐτέων.** On the genitive see Goodwin, *Gk. Gr.* §179, Monro, *Hom. Gr.* § 150. Seven, a conventional number, we may suspect.

οὐκ ὗε (ὁ θεὸς) τὴν Θήρην, *ὕεται* passive, c. 50 *supra.* In this visitation it might perhaps be fanciful to see a distorted reminiscence of an early, or a prehistoric, eruption. It cannot however be said with accuracy that from the colonisation of Membliaros onwards "we have a consecutive account of the inhabitants" (Bent, *op. cit.* p. 106).

2. **πλὴν ἑνός.** Santorin is described as "favourable for the growth of nothing but the grape." Was this one survivor a generic vine?

5. **Κρήτην.** An early home of navigation, Thuc. 1. 4, Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 10, 4, 1271^b. So Odysseus in Ithaka gives himself out as a Kretan *Od.* 14. 199. But could the Cretans be trusted to tell them? Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται. Cp. *Antholog.* 7. 275. It is, by the way, remarkable that the 'Dorians' of Thera made no application to those Dorians of the Hexapolis, or of Aigina, who probably were already trading with Egypt (cp. 2. 178).

μετοίκων. The use of the word here raises several problems. The date of the application of the Theraeans to the Kretans is long after the Dorisation of both islands. The question arises, who are to be understood by the *Metics*? At Athens, or in an Athenian story, the meaning would be technical, but metic does not appear as a Kretan term. Are they identical with the περίοικοι of Aristot. *Pol. l.c.* whom he describes with some inaccuracy (cp. Hoeckh, *Kreta*, iii. 23 ff.), or with the ἀπέταιροι of the great Gortynian inscription? It is evident that they are persons who may be engaged in commerce, and it will be safe to assume that the word is used here, without prejudice, to include any residents who were not 'Kretans.' L. & S. seem to take the word here in the more definite sense of 'immigrants.' If that were pressed, the 'metics' would include the Dorians; the 'Kretans' might be the aboriginals (Perioikoi etc.). The word does not occur elsewhere in Hdt. On the Laws of Gortyn, see H. J. Roby in *Law Quarterly Review*, ii. 135 ff., J. W. Headlam, *J.H.S.* xiii. 48 ff.

7. **Ἴτανον.** Itanos: "the most easterly town of Krete," Hoeckh, *op. c.* i. p. 17—the foundation ascribed to Phoenicians, Steph. Byz. *sub v.*

πορφυρέι. Not a common word (cp. L. & S.), probably a murex-fisher. Platea has been identified with Bomba.

12. **λείπουσι.** Why they should have left Korobios, or what he was to do, all alone on a desert island, we are to ascertain by conjecture. The particularity with which names are given in this story cannot disguise the pragmatic character of the tradition. Whether Korobios was a 'Kretan' or a 'Metic' is not expressly stated, but cp. Appendix XII. It seems improbable that the Kretans and their metics should not have been well acquainted with Libya long before this time, but like other ancient monopolists they perhaps kept their knowledge as much as might be to themselves: and possibly Korobios the metic was bribed rather than hired to give the coveted information. Hoeckh (iii. 420) sees in the difficulty with which information about Libya was procured an evidence that the commerce

λιπόντες ὅσων δὴ μηνῶν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἔπλεον τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαγγε-
152 λέοντες Θηραίοισι περὶ τῆς νήσου. ἀποδημεόντων δὲ τούτων πλέω χρόνον τοῦ συγκειμένου τὸν Κορώβιον ἐπέλιπε τὰ πάντα. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα νηῦς Σαμίη, τῆς ναύκληρος ἦν Κωλαῖος, πλέουσα ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀπηνείχθη ἐς τὴν Πλατέαν ταύτην· πυθόμενοι δὲ οἱ Σάμιοι παρὰ τοῦ Κορωβίου τὸν πάντα λόγον, σιτία οἱ ἐνιαυτοῦ καταλείπουσι. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀναχθέντες ἐκ τῆς νήσου καὶ γλιχόμενοι Αἰγύπτου ἔπλεον, ἀποφερόμενοι ἀπηλιώτῃ ἀνέμῳ· καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἀνίει τὸ πνεῦμα, Ἡρακλέας στήλας διεκπερήσαντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς Ταρτησσόν, θείῃ πομπῇ χρεώμενοι. τὸ δὲ ἐμπόριον τοῦτο ἦν ἀκήρατον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, ὥστε ἀπονοστήσαντες οὗτοι ὀπίσω μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἀτρεκείην ἴδμεν ἐκ φορτίων ἐκέρδησαν, μετά γε Σώστρατον

---

of Krete was at this time (c. 620 B.C.) decayed. It may, indeed, be supposed that the Ionians had damaged it: a Samian ship presently (c. 152) makes its appearance at Platea, *en route* for Egypt.

152. 3. **ναύκληρος.** Probably he was on board, 1. 5, Thuc. 1. 137, 2. This was a fortunate accident for Korobios, but it is difficult to understand how a Samian ship sailing towards Egypt (from Samos) should find itself at Bomba, the usual route being *via* Rhodes (Kypros), cp. 2. 182, Thuc. 8. 35, 2, unless indeed the strong E. or N.E. wind was blowing which afterwards drave the Samians all the way to Tartessos: in which case it is difficult to understand why they put to sea again if they really wished to make Egypt. Blakesley suggests that Kolaios touched at Bomba not on his way *to* but on his way *from* Egypt, his line being from Egypt to Krete and then to Samos. This saves one point in the narrative at the expense of another. The whole stands or falls together as far as the credit of Hdt. and his sources for the particular story are concerned, though, of course, as usual in such cases, real relations have been incorporated in more or less fictitious records. The probability is that these trade-routes were very much older and known much longer to the Greeks of Asia than Hdt. seems here to recognise. Not to raise remoter problems, since 650 B.C. at least a regular Greek settlement had been maintained in Egypt, and people in Samos at any rate, if not in Thera, must have known where 'Libyans' were to be found: viz. to the west of Egypt.

8. **Ἡρακλέας στήλας.** On the original στῆλαι 2. 44.

9. **Ταρτησσόν.** Cp. Meltzer, *Ges. d. Karthager*, i. 35; Kiepert's *Manual*, § 247, the Tarshish of Scripture by Hdt. used apparently of a city, or perhaps a district (Baetica) 1. 163, by other writers sometimes used of the river Guadalquiver (*e.g.* Stesichoros *apud* Strab. 148) and cp. the use of Aigyptos, Borysthenes, Istros, etc. Tartessos was long in the hands of the Phoenicians, prae-Carthaginian and perhaps anti-Carthaginian, the rivalry facilitating the intrusion of third parties.

9. **θείῃ πομπῇ.** For no Phoenician would have shown them the way, as Korobios the metic had done to the Theraeans. For the formula see Introduction, p. cxii.

10. **ἀκήρατον.** Inaccurate, seeing that the Phoenicians had long held it. The story may be not literally inconsistent with the assertion in regard to the Phokaians, 1. 163 f., seeing that the adventure of Kolaios may be regarded as an isolated one, preceding by something like a quarter of a century the foundation of Massalia, and the Phokaian friendship with Arganthonios. All the same, the point of view and spirit of the two traditions are not harmonious: they ignore if they do not contradict one another. Of this Hdt. does not appear conscious. Cp. c. 150 *supra*.

12. **Σώστρατον.** Where and when Sostratos made his money is unfortunately not stated: perhaps in Egypt, 2. 178, though trade with the uncivilised is as a rule the more profitable. On the

τὸν Λαοδάμαντος Αἰγινήτην· τούτῳ γὰρ οὐκ οἷά τέ ἐστι ἐρίσαι
ἄλλον. οἱ δὲ Σάμιοι τὴν δεκάτην τῶν ἐπικερδίων ἐξελόντες ἓξ
τάλαντα ἐποιήσαντο χαλκήιον κρητῆρος Ἀργολικοῦ τρόπον·
πέριξ δὲ αὐτοῦ γρυπῶν κεφαλαὶ πρόκροσσοί εἰσι· καὶ ἀνέθηκαν
ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον, ὑποστήσαντες αὐτῷ τρεῖς χαλκέους κολοσσοὺς
ἑπταπήχεας τοῖσι γούνασι ἐρηρεισμένους. Κυρηναίοισι δὲ καὶ
Θηραίοισι ἐς Σαμίους ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἔργου πρῶτα φιλίαι
μεγάλαι συνεκρήθησαν. οἱ δὲ Θηραῖοι ἐπείτε τὸν Κορώβιον 153
λιπόντες ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὴν Θήρην, ἀπήγγελλον ὥς
σφι εἴη νῆσος ἐπὶ Λιβύῃ ἐκτισμένη. Θηραίοισι δὲ ἔαδε

---

superlative formula, cp. Introduction, p. civ.

14. **τὴν δεκάτην.** "The entire profit was therefore between £14,500 and £15,000," Rawlinson. But this of course means immensely greater value, owing to the high purchasing power of money then. On the mines in Spain cp. Ridgway, *Origin of Currency*, pp. 97 ff.

15. **ἐποιήσαντο,** middle. Cp. γραψάμενος c. 88 *supra*. ABC have the poorer ἐποίησαν here.

χαλκήιον, c. 81 *supra*. Hdt. unfortunately does not preserve the artist's name; no doubt they employed local talent. Was it Theodoros? 1. 51, 3. 41. Cp. K. O. Müller, *Ancient Art* (Eng. Tr.), § 60, A. S. Murray, *Greek Sculpture*, i. p. 78.

Ἀργολικοῦ, c. 61 *supra*.

16. **γρυπῶν κεφαλαί,** c. 79 *supra*.

πρόκροσσοι. Rawlinson, "standing out in high relief." L. & S. p. 1289 render: "placed at regular intervals." But battlements (κρόσσαι) and tassels, or a fringe (κροσσοί), are continuous, and so perhaps was the row of griffin heads around this Argolic krater: probably on the body. The word occurs again 7. 188 of ships at sea, and in Homer, *Il.* 14. 35, of ships on land.

17. **τὸ Ἥραιον,** 3. 60 and c. 88 *supra*, where no doubt Hdt. saw it and heard, one can hardly say how much of the preceding story. Cp. Introduction, pp. lix. lxxxii.

18. **Κυρηναίοισι δὲ καὶ Θηραίοισι ἐς Σαμίους.** Kyrene, Thera, Samos: Thera acting as half-way house, though they would hardly pass Krete without touching probably at Itanos (c. 151 *supra*).

19. **ἔργου.** Not the work of art but the work of mercy just narrated.

φιλίαι μεγάλαι does not necessarily mean an 'alliance' (Rawlinson, *note*). Cp. 6. 21.

153. 3. **ἔαδε,** *placuit*, cp. c. 145 *supra*. Three points in the colonial decree may be distinguished: (1) Brothers were to draw lots which should go, families wherein there was only one son not being touched. (2) No women accompanied the expedition: a definite number of *men* were selected from the seven parishes. What the number was is not stated, at least in our text. Stein suggests that it has fallen out after ἄνδρας. σʹ = διηκοσίους (Mahaffy and Cobet) is accepted by van Herwerden. The pentekonters have been made the basis of a calculation. Rawlinson allows 200 men as a maximum to a pentekonter, *i.e.* the complement of a trireme, and is not content with 400 men for a colony: 80 is nearer the mark, cp. 7. 184. This would give 160 men. But the two pentekonters dwindle to one vessel and its bare complement, 'insignis paucitas,' *ap.* Justin 13. 7, 4. The smaller the number the better the moral. K. O. Müller by a slip transfers the pentekonters to Theras and his advent to Kalliste, *Orchom.*[2] p. 334. He has confounded two pentekonters with three triekonters, c. 148. Rawlinson well observes: "The numerical accuracy affected by the Theraean narrative is remarkable," *i.e.* fictitious. Whatever the number of men, they obtained wives in Libya by one or another means, c. 186 *infra*. (Cp. Pindar's record of Barke (Alkeis) given as an athletic prize by Antaios, native King of Irasa, and won by Alexidamos, ancestor of the Pythian victor Telesikrates, perhaps an Aegeid, *Pyth.* 9.) (3) One 'Battos' appointed oekist-monarch. In Pindar his proper name is given, viz. Aristoteles, *Pyth.* 5. 87. In

ἀδελφεόν τε ἀπ' ἀδελφεοῦ πέμπειν πάλῳ λαγχάνοντα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν χώρων ἁπάντων ἑπτὰ ἐόντων ἄνδρας . . , εἶναι δέ σφεων καὶ ἡγεμόνα καὶ βασιλέα Βάττον. οὕτω δὴ στέλλουσι δύο πεντηκοντέρους ἐς τὴν Πλατέαν.

154 Ταῦτα δὲ Θηραῖοι λέγουσι, τὰ δ' ἐπίλοιπα τοῦ λόγου συμφέρονται ἤδη Θηραῖοι Κυρηναίοισι. Κυρηναῖοι γὰρ τὰ περὶ Βάττον οὐδαμῶς ὁμολογέουσι Θηραίοισι· λέγουσι γὰρ οὕτω. ἔστι τῆς Κρήτης Ὀαξὸς πόλις, ἐν τῇ ἐγένετο Ἐτέαρχος βασιλεύς, ὃς ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ ἀμήτορι τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Φρονίμη, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ ἔγημε ἄλλην γυναῖκα. ἡ δὲ ἐπεσελθοῦσα ἐδικαίου καὶ τῷ ἔργῳ εἶναι μητρυιὴ τῇ Φρονίμῃ, παρέχουσά τε κακὰ καὶ πᾶν ἐπ' αὐτῇ μηχανωμένη, καὶ τέλος μαχλοσύνην ἐπενείκασά οἱ πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα ταῦτα ἔχειν οὕτω. ὁ δὲ ἀναγνωσθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς ἔργον οὐκ ὅσιον ἐμηχανᾶτο ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρί. ἦν γὰρ δὴ Θεμίσων ἀνὴρ Θηραῖος ἔμπορος ἐν τῇ Ὀαξῷ· τοῦτον ὁ Ἐτέαρχος παραλαβὼν ἐπὶ ξείνια ἐξορκοῖ ἦ μέν οἱ διηκονήσειν ὅ τι ἂν δεηθῇ. ἐπείτε δὴ ἐξώρκωσε, ἀγαγών οἱ παραδιδοῖ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ θυγατέρα καὶ ταύτην ἐκέλευε καταποντῶσαι ἀπαγαγόντα. ὁ δὲ Θεμίσων περιημεκτήσας τῇ ἀπάτῃ τοῦ ὅρκου καὶ διαλυσάμενος τὴν ξεινίην ἐποίεε τοιάδε· παραλαβὼν τὴν παῖδα ἀπέπλεε· ὡς δὲ ἐγίνετο ἐν τῷ πελάγεϊ, ἀποσιεύμενος τὴν ἐξόρκωσιν τοῦ Ἐτεάρχου, σχοινίοισι αὐτὴν διαδήσας κατῆκε ἐς τὸ πέλαγος,
155 ἀνασπάσας δὲ ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Θήρην. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ τὴν Φρονίμην

Justin (*l.c. supra*) this appears as Aristaios (*i.e.* Apollo, cp. c. 15 *supra*) son of Kirnos. 'Battos' may be regarded as the native (Libyan) title, cp. c. 155 *infra*. That monarchy was the form of government from the first seems to show that the foundation did not proceed from a republican movement at home, and helps to explain its long or late maintenance in Kyrene.

154. 1. **τὰ ἐπίλοιπα.** Not given till c. 156. Hdt. proceeding first with the Kyrenaean variant for the story of Battos (154-156) which connects Kyrene with Krete. The Kretan connexion in the former story is supplied by Korobios the 'metic' of Itanos.

4. **Ὀαξός.** Town situate on a rapid river (Virg. *Ec.* 1. 66) of the same name, at some distance from the sea. It was connected (like Kyrene) with the worship of Apollo. (Hoeckh, *Kreta*, i. p. 19.) It was also connected in legend with the name of Minos (*vid.* Steph. B. *sub v.* Ὄαξος) and Hoeckh suggests that it was the last seat of the ancient 'Minoan' monarchy, an inference based apparently upon this passage. For the form Ἀξὸς given here by β (=RVS) cp. Cauer, *Delectus*[2], no. 122, Head, *Historia*, p. 387.

"The names Phronime and Themison are obviously merely allegorical." K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos*[2], p. 336 n. The names are significant: but every significant name is not necessarily unhistoric. Even the name Ἐτέαρχος (real ruler) is however suspicious. (Cp. Ἐτεόκρητες, *Od.* 19. 176.)

7. **πᾶν.** Cp. *πᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδῃσι μηχανώμενοι* 5. 62.

15. **τῇ ἀπάτῃ τοῦ ὅρκου.** This bondage to the letter and the casuistry of evasion thereby generated is further illustrated c. 201 *infra*. Cp. the story of Kleomenes, Plutarch, *Apoth. Lac.* Kleomenis, 2. 3 (*Mor.* 223).

18. **διαδήσας.** Cp. *διαλελαμμένος* c. 68 *supra*.

παραλαβὼν Πολύμνηστος, ἐὼν τῶν Θηραίων ἀνὴρ δόκιμος, ἐπαλλακεύετο. χρόνου δὲ περιιόντος ἐξεγένετό οἱ παῖς ἰσχόφωνος καὶ τραυλός, τῷ οὔνομα ἐτέθη Βάττος, ὡς Θηραῖοί τε καὶ Κυρηναῖοι λέγουσι, ὡς μέντοι ἐγὼ δοκέω, ἄλλο τι· Βάττος δὲ μετωνομάσθη, ἐπείτε ἐς Λιβύην ἀπίκετο, ἀπό τε τοῦ χρηστηρίου τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Δελφοῖσι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τὴν ἔσχε τὴν ἐπωνυμίην ποιεύμενος. Λίβυες γὰρ βασιλέα Βάττον καλέουσι, καὶ τούτου εἵνεκα δοκέω θεσπίζουσαν τὴν Πυθίην καλέσαι μιν Λιβυκῇ γλώσσῃ, εἰδυῖαν ὡς βασιλεὺς ἔσται ἐν Λιβύῃ. ἐπείτε γὰρ ἠνδρώθη οὗτος, ἦλθε ἐς Δελφοὺς περὶ τῆς φωνῆς· ἐπειρωτῶντι δέ οἱ χρᾷ ἡ Πυθίη τάδε.

Βάττ', ἐπὶ φωνὴν ἦλθες· ἄναξ δέ σε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
ἐς Λιβύην πέμπει μηλοτρόφον οἰκιστῆρα,

ὥσπερ εἰ εἴποι Ἑλλάδι γλώσσῃ χρεωμένη "ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐπὶ φωνὴν ἦλθες." ὁ δ' ἀμείβετο τοισίδε. "ὦναξ, ἐγὼ μὲν ἦλθον παρὰ σὲ χρησάμενος περὶ τῆς φωνῆς, σὺ δέ μοι ἄλλα ἀδύνατα χρᾷς, κελεύων Λιβύην ἀποικίζειν τέῳ δυνάμι, κοίῃ χειρί;" ταῦτα λέγων οὐκὶ ἔπειθε ἄλλα οἱ χρᾶν· ὡς δὲ κατὰ ταὐτὰ ἐθέσπιζέ οἱ καὶ πρότερον, οἴχετο μεταξὺ ἀπολιπὼν ὁ Βάττος ἐς τὴν Θήρην.

---

155. 2. **Πολύμνηστος.** The Theraean version recognised Polymnestos as the father of the founder, c. 150 *supra*.

3. **ἐπαλλακεύετο.** He could not make her his wife, she being a foreigner. But the result is a shadow over the birth of the founder, as so often in the foundation legends of the colonies, which was deepened by his physical defects (*ἰσχνόφωνος* and *τραυλός*). These physical defects are probably an inference from the misinterpretation of his title (Battos) and are not to be rationalised away into a charge against his Kretan mother.

5. **ἄλλο τι.** Hdt. is no doubt right, though it is strange that he should not know the name (Aristoteles, c. 153 *supra*), and incredible that the Kyrenaeans should not have known it. That his informants, or his documents, may have made the assertion is of course possible. That Aristoteles was called Battos prophetically by the Pythia can hardly be regarded as impossible, but if true, seems to imply that something was known in Delphi about Libya and the Libyans, cp. c. 150 *supra*, however ignorant the Theraeans were. The 'Kyrenaean' version of the visit of Aristoteles Battos to Delphi differs from the Theraean previously given in the following points: (1) He goes to Delphi on his own account to ask about his voice (*φωνῆς*): there simply in the train of Grinos. (2) The interview with the Pythia is quite different. (3) In the former (Theraean) version it is the universal ignorance of Libya which leads to disobedience of the god's mandate: here simply the humility or impotence of Battos.

8. **βασιλέα Βάττον.** For the passage of a title into a proper name cp. cases of Augustus, Pendragon, Arthur, etc. (F. Wise's Letter to Dr. Mead concerning some Antiquities of Berkshire, Oxford 1738, cites Baxter, *Glossarium Antiq. Brit. sub vv.* ARVIRAGUS, PENDRAGON = caput gentis). It is curious that the name Battos occurs in the myths of Arkadia and Messenia, cp. Ovid, *Metam.* 2. 705, cp. Grasberger, *Gr. Ortsnamen*, p. 18, E. Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, ii. 198 (note 49 to *Landschaft Messenien*). Thuc. 4. 43, has it as a proper name.

15. **ὥσπερ . . ἦλθες.** Van H. follows Valckenaer in bracketing as a gloss, and suggests that the verses were originally in Doric. Cp. c. 157 *infra*.

156 μετὰ δὲ αὐτῷ τε τούτῳ καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Θηραίοισι συνεφέρετο παλιγκότως· ἀγνοεῦντες δὲ τὰς συμφορὰς οἱ Θηραῖοι ἔπεμπον ἐς Δελφοὺς περὶ τῶν παρεόντων κακῶν. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφι ἔχρησε συγκτίζουσι Βάττῳ Κυρήνην τῆς Λιβύης ἄμεινον πρήξειν. ἀπέστελλον μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν Βάττον οἱ Θηραῖοι δύο πεντηκοντέροισι. πλώσαντες δὲ ἐς τὴν Λιβύην οὗτοι, οὐ γὰρ εἶχον ὅ τι ποιέωσι ἄλλο, ὀπίσω ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς τὴν Θήρην. οἱ δὲ Θηραῖοι καταγομένους ἔβαλλον καὶ οὐκ ἔων τῇ γῇ προσίσχειν, ἀλλ' ὀπίσω πλώειν ἐκέλευον. οἱ δὲ ἀναγκαζόμενοι ὀπίσω ἀπέπλεον καὶ ἔκτισαν νῆσον ἐπὶ Λιβύῃ κειμένην, τῇ οὔνομα, ὡς καὶ πρότερον εἰρέθη, ἐστὶ Πλατέα. λέγεται δὲ ἴση εἶναι ἡ
157 νῆσος τῇ νῦν Κυρηναίων πόλι. ταύτην οἰκέοντες δύο ἔτεα, οὐδὲν γάρ σφι χρηστὸν συνεφέρετο, ἕνα αὐτῶν καταλιπόντες οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες ἀπέπλεον ἐς Δελφούς, ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ

---

156. 1. **συνεφέρετο** in the Kyrenaean version represents the fuller details given in the Theraean, c. 151 *supra*.

5. **δύο πεντηκοντέροισι.** c. 153 they appear in the Theraean version, but at a later, and less likely point: here they correspond *prima facie* to the *ἔπλεον κατάσκοποι ἄνδρες τὰ πρῶτα οὐ πολλοί* of c. 151; but no addition is made to the two pentekonters in this passage, on their return to Thera, and so a substantial agreement is re-established between the two versions upon this point.

8. **ἔβαλλον.** In this hostile passage between the Theraeans and the *émigrés* Stein sees a hint of the real reason of the adventure, for according to Menekles of Barca (c. 120 B.C.) Battos was head of a political faction, and was driven out of Thera, consulted the oracle whether he should attempt a return or found a colony, and was recommended to adopt the latter course. Schol. Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 10, and Müller, *Frag. H. G.* vol. iv. p. 449.

11. **πρότερον.** That is, in c. 151 *supra*, in the Theraean *λόγος*.

Πλατέα. The occupation of Platea is another point common to the two versions, but in the Theraean *λόγος* Platea is occupied from the first, c. 151 *supra*, while here Platea is first occupied on the return of the colonists.

λέγεται. It may be argued from this expression that Hdt. had not seen both Platea and Kyrene, though it does not follow that he had seen either, cp. Introduction, p. xcvii.

12. **πόλι.** Acropolis ?

157. Somewhere in this chapter *τὰ ἐπίλοιπα τοῦ λόγου* (c. 154) may be taken to begin: *i.e.* the Theraeans do not contradict the Kyrenaean story of what happened in Libya, though they contradict *τὰ περὶ Βάττον*, cc. 154-156.

2. **ἕνα αὐτῶν.** Does duty for Korobios the "metic" c. 151, who is however put at a different stage of the proceedings. The harmonist might say there were three visits: (1) Korobios and his Theraean companions *οὐ πολλοί* c. 151. (2) The colonists' first visit and departure leaving *another* man. (3) The colonists for final occupation. But such attempts do not even reconcile the particulars, *e.g.* the points at which Platea is occupied in the two stories, much less account for the variation, or detect the moral or *Tendenz*. In any case this one man was to be regarded no doubt as sufficient to assert the proprietary rights of occupation. Cp. passage in Maine, *Ancient Law*, c. viii. on 'The Roman principle of Occupancy as the source of the acquisition of sovereign rights in newly discovered countries' (pp. 244-250).

It might be argued from the way in which Hdt. arranges the pieces that he considers the Theraean story (150-153) the more probable. Hdt. has not, however, indicated clearly whether it begins after *δύο πεντηκοντέροισι*, c. 156, or at *Πλατέα*, cp. closing words of c. 153, or whether it begins here at *ἀπέπλεον ἐς Δελφούς* or at *ἀπικόμενοι, κτλ.*

3. **ἀπικόμενοι.** This visit of the colonists to Delphi is a fresh fact, beside

χρηστήριον ἐχρέωντο, φάμενοι οἰκέειν τε τὴν Λιβύην καὶ οὐδὲν ἄμεινον πρήσσειν οἰκεῦντες. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφι πρὸς ταῦτα χρᾷ τάδε.

αἰ τὺ ἐμεῦ Λιβύην μηλοτρόφον οἶδας ἄμεινον,
μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐλθόντος, ἄγαν ἄγαμαι σοφίην σεῦ.

ἀκούσαντες δὲ τούτων οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Βάττον ἀπέπλωον ὀπίσω· οὐ γὰρ δή σφεας ἀπίει ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀποικίης, πρὶν δὴ ἀπίκωνται ἐς αὐτὴν Λιβύην. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐς τὴν νῆσον καὶ ἀναλαβόντες τὸν ἔλιπον, ἔκτισαν αὐτῆς τῆς Λιβύης χῶρον ἀντίον τῆς νήσου τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Ἄζιρις· τὸν νάπαι τε κάλλισται ἐπ' ἀμφότερα

---

the battle with the Theraeans, and was placed by Menekles, who may have been a rationalising harmonist rather than a historian with better sources, before the settlement at Platea. Here again the stories can be reconciled by multiplying the visits to Delphi (visit to Delphi: battle off Thera: occupation of Platea: second visit to Delphi); but such attempts are misplaced ingenuity, where you are dealing with unauthoritative traditions obviously belonging to variant cycles. It is far more likely that such stories, each of which professes to be the whole story, and is in a way complete in itself, should be inconsistent with each other, and with facts, than that a complete and consistent and true narrative is to be extracted by combinations and permutations in the details of them all.

7. **αἰ τύ.** The oracle contains Dorisms on the strength of which K. O. Müller (*Orchom.*^{2} p. 339) argues that it must be derived from the local oral tradition and not from a Delphic source: as if Attic poets could write Doric on occasion, and the Delphians in a Dorian affair could not produce dialectic congruities! (*Sua Dialecto Cyrenaei vel acceperant vel* etc., Valckenaer.) Diodor. 8. 29 preserves a longer variant, which suggests a poetic version of the Foundation-legend (cp. Introduction, p. lxxxv.); but it is as likely that the poem was an expansion of the oracle, as that the oracle was distilled from the poem. Müller must, however, be right in arguing that the oracle dates after the development of the local myth of Apollo and Kyrene, so charmingly utilised by Pindar, *Pyth.* 9: (for Theraean and Kyrenaean dialects cp. Cauer, *Delectus*^{2}, nos. 141-153).

μηλοτρόφον. The trade with Libya may have included wool, or may have been expected to do so: but sheep do not appear among the celebrated products of that favoured region (cp. *Dict. Geogr.* i. 732 b), nor does Kyrene figure among the well-known staples of the wool-trade. The flocks of the Nasamones, however, are mentioned, c. 172 *infra* (cp. Büchsenschütz, *Besitz und Erwerb*, 220 ff.). Plutarch, *Mor.* 408, quotes this oracle, with *μαλοτρόφον οἶσθας ἄρειον*.

The epithet *μηλοτρόφος* is applied to Asia by Archilochos, *Fr.* 26 [89] (Bergk, ii.^{4} p. 390) and Aischylos, *Pers.* 763 (cp. *Φρύγες πολυπροβατώτατοι* 5. 49 *infra*). Büchsenschütz, *op. c.* p. 223, converts the Demeter Melophoros of Megara (Pausan. 1. 44, 3) into a Demeter Melotrophos, a title for which there appears to be no evidence: L. & S. make the goddess bear them *apples*, perhaps rightly (cp. Preller, *Gr. Myth.* i.^{4} 769), though the passage in Pausanias runs: *τοὺς πρώτους πρόβατα ἐν τῇ γῇ θρέψαντας Δήμητρα ὀνομάσαι Μαλοφόρον.* Pausanias has, however, just before: *λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν.*

13. **Ἄζιρις.** The name of this district (*χῶρος*) has a thoroughly native sound: sometimes softened into Ἄζιλις, then rationalised into Ἄξυλις, by the Greeks. A definite settlement (*ἔκτισαν*) is implied. In Ptol. 4. 5, 2, a village of the name is the first mentioned in the *Μαρμαρικὴ νόμος*. The name does not occur in Strabo, where it might be expected (838), nor in the extant works of Sallust, notwithstanding the passage in Steph. Byz. which may here conveniently follow: Ἄζιλις, *πόλις Λιβύης. οἱ δὲ περὶ Σαλούστιον οὐ πόλιν ἀλλὰ τόπον φασὶ καὶ ποταμὸν εἶναι. τινὲς δὲ* [*e.g.* Hdt.] *Ἄζιριν μετὰ τοῦ ρ λέγουσι τὸν*

158 συγκληίουσι καὶ ποταμὸς τὰ ἐπὶ θάτερα παραρρέει. τοῦτον οἴκεον τὸν χῶρον ἓξ ἔτεα, ἑβδόμῳ δέ σφεας ἔτεϊ παραιτησάμενοι οἱ Λίβυες ὡς ἐς ἀμείνονα χῶρον ἄξουσι, ἀνέγνωσαν ἐκλιπεῖν. ἦγον δέ σφεας ἐνθεῦτεν οἱ Λίβυες ἀναστήσαντες πρὸς ἑσπέρην, καὶ τὸν κάλλιστον τῶν χώρων ἵνα διεξιόντες οἱ Ἕλληνες μὴ ἴδοιεν, συμμετρησάμενοι τὴν ὥρην τῆς ἡμέρης νυκτὸς παρῆγον. ἔστι δὲ τῷ χώρῳ τούτῳ οὔνομα Ἴρασα. ἀγαγόντες δέ σφεας ἐπὶ κρήνην λεγομένην εἶναι Ἀπόλλωνος εἶπαν "ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, ἐνθαῦτα ὑμῖν ἐπιτήδεον οἰκέειν· ἐνθαῦτα γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τέτρηται."

159 Ἐπὶ μέν νυν Βάττου τε τοῦ οἰκιστέω τῆς ζόης, ἄρξαντος ἐπὶ τεσσεράκοντα ἔτεα, καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἀρκεσίλεω ἄρξαντος ἑκκαίδεκα ἔτεα, οἴκεον οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ἐόντες τοσοῦτοι ὅσοι ἀρχὴν ἐς τὴν ἀποικίην ἐστάλησαν. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τρίτου, Βάττου τοῦ εὐδαίμονος καλεομένου, Ἕλληνας πάντας ὥρμησε χρήσασα ἡ Πυθίη πλέειν συνοικήσοντας Κυρηναίοισι Λιβύην· ἐπεκαλέοντο γὰρ οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναδασμῷ· ἔχρησε δὲ ὧδε ἔχοντα.

ὃς δέ κεν ἐς Λιβύην πολυήρατον ὕστερον ἔλθῃ
γᾶς ἀναδαιομένας, μετά οἵ ποκά φαμι μελήσειν.

συλλεχθέντος δὲ ὁμίλου πολλοῦ ἐς τὴν Κυρήνην, περιταμνόμενοι γῆν πολλὴν οἱ περίοικοι Λίβυες καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν

χῶρον. Χάραξ δὲ Ἄξιρον λέγει αὐτήν. It was near but not identical with the "Harbour of Menelaos," cp. c. 169 *infra*. There is nothing in Hdt.'s description or reference to justify the conclusion that he had visited the spot. On the beauty of Utility cp. c. 147 *supra*.

158. 2. **ἓξ ἔτεα.** On the date: Clinton, *Fasti H. ad ann.* 639-637 B.C.

ἑβδόμῳ looks conventional, cp. c. 151 *supra*. Platea, Aziris (Irasa), Kyrene form successive stations, probably in time as well as space, of the Hellenic mmigration. The natives are here represented as on friendly terms with the settlers (cp. note c. 153 *infra*), but the anecdote looks suspiciously like a reply to critics, who wondered that the Greeks had passed by the best spot and chosen an inferior one (cp. anecdote c. 144 *supra*). Irasa is named by Pindar, *Pyth.* 9. 106, as πόλις Ἀνταίου. The κρήνη Ἀπόλλωνος (cp. Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 294) was called κυρὴ or κύρη Bekker, *Anecd.* p. 1173, and gave its name to the town.

9. **ὁ οὐρανὸς τέτρηται** refers of course to rainfall. The expression seems to imply that the welkin is solid. Stein compares Gen. 7. 11, Malachi 3. 10. See c. 184 *infra* τὸν κίονα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

159. 1. **ζόης.** Instead of βίος: cp. c. 112 *supra*.

2. **τεσσεράκοντα.** The forty years may be spread over the three settlements, Platea two years (c. 157), Aziris six years (c. 158) leaving thirty-two years in Kyrene. This chronology is exact: whether it is true is another question, cp. Appendix XII.

3. **τοσοῦτοι.** That the original number of Kyrenaeans remained for fifty-six years without increase, or diminution, is a statement so absurd on the face of it that the author must be supposed to have meant something other than he says: perhaps merely that the city remained without ἔποικοι, fresh immigrants: *i.e.* that the number of κλῆροι remained unaltered.

6. **ἡ Πυθίη.** The oracle was set in motion by the Kyrenaeans, and they, presumably, made its favourable response known, perhaps at Pythian or Olympian festival (πάντας Ἕλληνας), cp. 6. 126.

12. **γῆν πολλήν.** The land to be

τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Ἀδικράν, οἷα τῆς τε χώρης στερισκόμενοι καὶ περιυβριζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν Κυρηναίων, πέμψαντες ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἔδοσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς Ἀπρίῃ τῷ Αἰγύπτου βασιλέι. ὁ δὲ συλλέξας στρατὸν Αἰγυπτίων πολλὸν ἔπεμψε ἐπὶ τὴν Κυρήνην. οἱ δὲ Κυρηναῖοι ἐκστρατευσάμενοι ἐς Ἴρασα χῶρον καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην Θέστην συνέβαλόν τε τοῖσι Αἰγυπτίοισι καὶ ἐνίκησαν τῇ συμβολῇ. ἅτε γὰρ οὐ πεπειρημένοι πρότερον οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι Ἑλλήνων καὶ παραχρεώμενοι διεφθάρησαν οὕτω ὥστε ὀλίγοι τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀπενόστησαν ἐς Αἴγυπτον. ἀντὶ τούτων Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ ταῦτα ἐπιμεμφόμενοι Ἀπρίῃ ἀπέστησαν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

Τούτου δὲ τοῦ Βάττου παῖς γίνεται Ἀρκεσίλεως· ὃς βασι- 160
λεύσας πρῶτα τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ ἀδελφεοῖσι ἐστασίασε, ἐς ὅ μιν οὗτοι ἀπολιπόντες οἴχοντο ἐς ἄλλον χῶρον τῆς Λιβύης καὶ

---

divided is taken at the expense of the natives, and a breach in the relations hitherto friendly (c. 158) is thereby made.

12. **Λίβυες.** Libyans had long had relations with Egypt: they appear among the conquests of Amenophis II. (18th Dynasty) and Ramses II., and contributed by their invasions to the fall of the "Middle Empire." (See Wiedemann, *Aegypt. G.* 374, 430, 473 ff., and on the present episode, p. 637.) Adikran seems a genuine name.

15. **Ἀπρίῃ**, 2. 161. In that passage Hdt. promises to recount at greater length (*μεζόνως*) *ἐν τοῖσι Λιβυκοῖσι λόγοισι* the *πρόφασις* which led to the downfall of Apries. Blakesley asks whether this promise can be said to be fulfilled in the meagre account of the affair here given. The difficulty has struck many, and the answer given has often been in the negative, various inferences in regard to the sources and composition of the work following therefrom. But it must be remarked that the real question is whether Hdt. under any circumstances could have thought the promise made in 2. 161 to be redeemed in this place. Now in 2. 161 Hdt. does not state the *reason* of the expedition of the Egyptians against Kyrene at all: here it appears as the application of the Libyans. Further particulars are here given, the name of the Libyan king, the name of the battlefield, and we might add the more remote cause which led to the application of the Libyan king. Unless then we press perhaps unduly the word *μεζόνως* in 2. 161, we may suppose that in revising his work Hdt. might allow this passage to pass as a sufficient discharge of the debt incurred in 2. 161, the more so, as on other grounds it may be plausibly maintained that this passage was written before that, though it takes a later place in the final form of his work. (Cp. Bauer, *die Entstehung*, pp. 66-69.)

17. **Ἴρασα**, c. 158 *supra*.

18. **Θέστην.** PR have *θέστιν*. Steph. Byz. has *θέστις, πόλις Ἀράβων καὶ ἄλλη Λιβύης.*

19. **οὐ πεπειρημένοι.** This statement has presumably been taken over from his authorities, or allowed to stand by Hdt. as originally written, for he could hardly have penned it deliberately for the first time after his researches in Egypt had taught him the position and achievements of Hellenic mercenaries there. Cp. 2. 152. But though he would hardly have written this passage after those, he may have allowed it to pass, in a revision, seeing that *πεπειρημένοι* might be taken to refer to aggressive measures, or at any rate that *Ἑλλήνων* might be restricted to free Greeks, Greeks acting on their own account, not mercenaries, like the Ionians and Karians. Yet that Egyptians would have 'despised' Greek soldiers at that date is incredible.

The absence of any reference to 2. 161 would be remarkable, if that passage had been composed before this.

160. 1. **βασιλεύσας.** 'After coming to the throne,' or 'on becoming king.' The *στάσις* is transferred to the royal

ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν βαλόμενοι ἔκτισαν πόλιν ταύτην ἣ τότε καὶ νῦν Βάρκη καλέεται· κτίζοντες δὲ ἅμα αὐτὴν ἀπιστᾶσι ἀπὸ τῶν Κυρηναίων τοὺς Λίβυας. μετὰ δὲ Ἀρκεσίλεως ἐς τοὺς ὑποδεξαμένους τε τῶν Λιβύων καὶ ἀποστάντας τοὺς αὐτοὺς τούτους ἐστρατεύετο· οἱ δὲ Λίβυες δείσαντες αὐτὸν οἴχοντο φεύγοντες πρὸς τοὺς ἠοίους τῶν Λιβύων. ὁ δὲ Ἀρκεσίλεως εἵπετο φεύγουσι, ἐς οὗ ἐν Λεύκωνί τε τῆς Λιβύης ἐγίνετο ἐπιδιώκων καὶ ἔδοξε τοῖσι Λίβυσι ἐπιθέσθαι οἱ. συμβαλόντες δὲ ἐνίκησαν τοὺς Κυρηναίους τοσοῦτο ὥστε ἑπτακισχιλίους ὁπλίτας Κυρηναίων ἐνθαῦτα πεσεῖν. μετὰ δὲ τὸ τρῶμα τοῦτο Ἀρκεσίλεων μὲν κάμνοντά τε καὶ φάρμακον πεπωκότα ὁ ἀδελφεὸς Ἁλίαρχος ἀποπνίγει, Ἁλίαρχον δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Ἀρκεσίλεω δόλῳ κτείνει, τῇ οὔνομα
161 ἦν Ἐρυξώ. διεδέξατο δὲ τὴν βασιληίην τοῦ Ἀρκεσίλεω ὁ

---

house, but was perhaps a larger movement, of the native Libyans against the Greek colonists.

4. **ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν βαλόμενοι.** Cp. 5. 73.

Βάρκη. Presumably a native name, a fact which may be in Hdt.'s mind when he says *τότε καὶ νῦν*. The identity with the surname of the great Hamilkar (Barak) is presumably a mere accident. The seceders evidently had a Libyan following, and the town no doubt was mixo-Libyan. The site of Barke is ascertained to the west of Kyrene: being accurately indicated in Skylax (Müller, *Geogr. min.* i. p. 83. Cp. *Dict. Geogr.* i. 378). In the Middle Age the name was applied to the whole district. Kiepert, *Manual*, § 122.

10. **Λεύκωνι** Stein suggests may be identified with the *Λευκόη* of Ptolemy 4. 5, 28, the most westerly of the inland villages of Marmarica: Leukoe must be placed well to the east of Kyrene (as on the map, xix. *Tabulae in Geographos minores*). The relation between the foundation of Barka on the west and this battle with the Libyans on the east of Kyrene is obscure: but the carnage of Leukoe is presumably a genuine memory. This *τρῶμα* may be compared with the losses of Argos (6000) 6. 83, 7. 148, of the men of Rhegion and Taras ($3000 + x$) 7. 170. The number of Sybarites slain by the men of Kroton (6. 21, 5. 44 f.) is not given by Hdt.

16. **Ἐρυξώ.** This chapter (160) has all the points from which a stirring and tragical drama might be composed. The scenery and savage environment: the Hellenic contrasts: the quarrel in the royal family: the battle and slaughter: poison, suicide, treachery and murder by princes and princesses. It is a pity that the Hellenic playwrights never utilised such material. Cp. story of Lykophron (3. 50-53). And yet did they not? Perhaps stories like these coming over sea from Asia and Libya, or preserved among the traditions of the Greek Tyrants, may have given Aischylos and Sophokles, poets of a democratic republic, a livelier comprehension of legends which for pious or practical reasons they revived out of the ancient and common stock of all Hellenes. The influence of the Greek Drama upon the Historians has been often emphasised, but the influence of the Greek Historians upon the Dramatists has not been sufficiently considered. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.

The relations between Haliarchos (Laarchos) and Arkesilaos were differently described in the sources followed by Plutarch, *de mulier. virt.* xxv. Eryxo (*Mor.* 260). Laarchos is not his brother, but a treacherous friend, who usurped the tyranny, nominally as guardian of Battos, and intrigued with Eryxo, but was by her entrapped to his death. According to Hdt. himself the brothers of Arkesilaos had retired to Barca.

The sequel of the story, after the death of Laarchos, is told by Plutarch *l. c.* very differently from Hdt. There is no mention of Demonax or his legislation: Battos is proclaimed king *ἐπὶ τοῖς*

παῖς Βάττος, χωλός τε ἐὼν καὶ οὐκ ἀρτίπους. οἱ δὲ Κυρηναῖοι πρὸς τὴν καταλαβοῦσαν συμφορὴν ἔπεμπον ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐπειρησομένους ὅντινα τρόπον καταστησάμενοι κάλλιστα ἂν οἰκέοιεν. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη ἐκέλευε ἐκ Μαντινέης τῆς Ἀρκάδων καταρτιστῆρα ἀγαγέσθαι. αἴτεον ὦν οἱ Κυρηναῖοι, καὶ οἱ Μαντινέες ἔδοσαν ἄνδρα τῶν ἀστῶν δοκιμώτατον, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Δημῶναξ. οὗτος ὦν ὡνὴρ ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὴν Κυρήνην καὶ μαθὼν ἕκαστα τοῦτο μὲν τριφύλους ἐποίησέ σφεας, τῇδε διαθείς· Θηραίων μὲν καὶ τῶν περιοίκων μίαν μοῖραν ἐποίησε, ἄλλην δὲ Πελοποννησίων καὶ Κρητῶν, τρίτην δὲ νησιωτέων πάντων.

πατρίοις, and Polyarchos, the eldest brother of the late king, who has conspired with Eryxo to overthrow Laarchos, restores the original constitution (*τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πολιτείαν ὁ Πολύαρχος ἀπέδωκε τοῖς Κυρηναίοις*). Shortly afterwards they effected a reconciliation with Amasis, who, according to Plutarch, has supported Laarchos. (Cp. 2. 181, where a history is preserved which, quite in accord with Hdt.'s methods, finds no place nor echo here.) The history of Kyrene, as told in *Dict. Geogr.* i. 734 f., takes no account of the material in Plutarch. With the version in Plutarch cp. the shorter (but earlier) accounts given by Polyaenus 8. 41 (ed. Woelfflin, p. 318 f.), Nic. Damasc. *Fr.* 51 (ed. L. Dindorf, i. p. 36 f.).

161. 2. **χωλός** looks like the translation into physics of the political situation. Cp. oracle on the *χωλὴ βασιλεία* Xen. *Hell.* 3. 3, 3, and the myth of Oedipus.

4. **καταστησάμενοι.** The 1 aor. mid. here is something of a *crux*. The phrase 5. 92, 6 *infra ὅντινα ἂν τρόπον ἀσφαλέστατον καταστησάμενος τῶν πρηγμάτων κάλλιστα τὴν πόλιν ἐπιτροπεύοι* is not exactly parallel. Krüger supplies *τὴν συμφορήν* (die unglücklichen Verhältnisse), Baehr and Stein however take the word of the *κατάστασις πόλιος* as in *l. c.*, in which case it might be as well to insert *τὰ πράγματα*, or *τὴν πόλιν* here. The transitive force of 1 aor. mid. is shown 8. 105. (But there van H. reads *κατεκτήσατο* after Cobet.)

5. **ἐκ Μαντινέης.** This would certainly have been strange, if Kyrene had been really made up of genuine Dorians: but neither the legislator nor his work is Dorian nor philo-Spartan: cp. Busolt, *Lakedaimonier*, i. 125 ff.

6. **καταρτιστῆρα.** Cp. 5. 28. The Kyrenaeans apparently ask for a constitution, and are given a legislator.

The *Κυρηναίων πολιτεία* is virtually lost (cp. V. Rose, *Arist. Frag.* ed. Teubner. p. 328), but perhaps it is to the work and policy of Demonax (*περὶ Κυρήνην οἱ τὸν δῆμον καθιστάντες*) that Aristotle refers *Pol.* 7. 4, 19, 1319^{b} as similar in policy and utility to that of Kleisthenes at Athens, *φυλαί τε γὰρ ἕτεραι ποιητέαι πλείους καὶ φρατρίαι, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἱερῶν συνακτέον εἰς ὀλίγα καὶ κοινά, καὶ πάντα σοφιστέον ὅπως ἂν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀναμιχθῶσι πάντες ἀλλήλοις αἱ δὲ συνήθειαι διαζευχθῶσιν αἱ πρότερον.*

9. **τριφύλους.** The number is the Dorian number, but the members are colluvial. *μοῖρα* below seems = *φυλή*, not a part of a *φυλή*. The first tribe is not Dorian, being composed of Theraeans and their clients, whether brought from Thera (Niebuhr) or native Libyans (K. O. Müller). The *Phylae* are in fact geographical, though not localised.

10. **περιοίκων.** Did they cease to be dependent, and receive the franchise (Niebuhr) or remain villeins (Müller, Rawlinson)? It seems more natural to suppose that *περίοικοι* refers to local relations in Kyrene: in which case a full franchise can hardly have been accorded. On the other hand there is no sense in their being mentioned unless they had some political status. It is possible that this first tribe of Theraeans formed something of a Eupatrid class, and were in possession or were assigned possession of the soil, and that the text is only a clumsy and obscure way of saying that the first or Theraean tribe formed a landed aristocracy.

11. **Πελοποννησίων καὶ Κρητῶν.** Neither is the second tribe Dorian,

τοῦτο δὲ τῷ βασιλέι Βάττῳ τεμένεα ἐξελὼν καὶ ἱρωσύνας, τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχον οἱ βασιλέες ἐς μέσον τῷ δήμῳ ἔθηκε.

162 Ἐπὶ μὲν δὴ τούτου τοῦ Βάττου οὕτω διετέλεε ἐόντα, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τούτου παιδὸς Ἀρκεσίλεω πολλὴ ταραχὴ περὶ τῶν τιμέων ἐγένετο. Ἀρκεσίλεως γὰρ ὁ Βάττου τε τοῦ χωλοῦ καὶ Φερετίμης οὐκ ἔφη ἀνέξεσθαι κατὰ τὰ ὁ Μαντινεὺς Δημῶναξ ἔταξε, ἀλλὰ ἀπαίτεε τὰ τῶν προγόνων γέρεα. ἐνθεῦτεν στασιάζων ἑσσώθη καὶ ἔφυγε ἐς Σάμον, ἡ δὲ μήτηρ οἱ ἐς Σαλαμῖνα τῆς Κύπρου ἔφυγε. τῆς δὲ Σαλαμῖνος τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἐπεκράτεε Εὐέλθων, ὃς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θυμιητήριον ἐὸν ἀξιοθέητον ἀνέθηκε, τὸ ἐν τῷ Κορινθίων θησαυρῷ κέεται. ἀπικομένη δὲ παρὰ τοῦτον ἡ Φερετίμη ἐδέετο στρατιῆς ἥ κατάξει σφέας ἐς τὴν Κυρήνην. ὁ δὲ Εὐέλθων πᾶν μᾶλλον ἢ στρατιήν οἱ ἐδίδου· ἡ δὲ λαμβάνουσα τὸ διδόμενον καλὸν μὲν ἔφη καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι, κάλλιον δὲ ἐκεῖνο, τὸ δοῦναί οἱ δεομένῃ στρατιήν. τοῦτο ἐπὶ παντὶ γὰρ τῷ διδομένῳ ἔλεγε, τελευταῖόν οἱ ἐξέπεμψε δῶρον ὁ Εὐέλθων ἄτρακτον χρύσεον καὶ ἠλακάτην, προσῆν δὲ καὶ εἴριον· ἐπειπάσης δὲ αὖτις τῆς Φερετίμης τὠυτὸ

---

though there might be a few Dorians among them. Still less is there anything to show that the tribe of Nesiots was Dorian. Rawlinson boldly makes it Ionian.

13. **ἐς μέσον.** Cp. 3. 142. The case of Maiandrios is an interesting and perhaps not accidental parallel: cp. c. 164 *infra*.

δήμῳ. Nor does this make a Dorian (Spartan) interest prominent.

162. 5. **γέρεα.** Royal honours, cp. 6. 56.

6. **Σάμον.** Polykrates was at the time (*c.* 530 B.C.) tyrant of Samos. Blakesley obviously exaggerates in suggesting that this visit of Arkesilaos might have caused "the whole [*sic*] history of Cyrene to be brought to the common [*sic*] knowledge of the Samians" (n. 424): but there are some curious coincidences in the stories of the Samian and Kyrenaean tyrants; cp. cc. 161 *supra*, 164 *infra*. Evelthon need not have been stricken in years at this time even if his grandson Gorgos is on the throne thirty years afterwards, 5. 104 *infra*.

οἱ. In his interests, by concert. Blakesley.

9. **ἀξιοθέητον.** Hdt. had presumably seen the said censer in the Corinthian treasury at Delphi, with the offerings of Gyges 1. 14, cp. Introduction, § 16, IV. Delphi owed the treasury properly speaking to Kypselos. On the overthrow of the *tyrannis*, the title no doubt was changed. Delphi rather than Samos appears throughout as the focus of these traditions (cp. c. 163), but the applications of Arkesilaos to Polykrates and of his mother to Evelthon suggest interesting problems of commercial and political intercourse between the states named (cp. c. 152 *supra*), and it is not likely that these matters were forgotten in Samos, or even in Zankle (6. 22 ff.).

12. **ἐδίδου . . τὸ διδόμενον . . τῷ διδομένῳ.** It is not meant that any actual gift passed except the golden spindle and distaff: this point is much plainer if we read *καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπὶ παντὶ τῷ διδομένῳ ἔλεγε κτλ.* Perhaps Pheretime's mission to Evelthon might have been more successful if her son had not been intriguing at the same time in Samos. The omission of Egypt from their counsels, and of the previous negociations with Amasis, from Hdt.'s narrative are observable (*vide* c. 160 *supra*), specially in the light of c. 165 *infra*: had Amasis and Polykrates already broken?

ἔπος, ὁ Εὐέλθων ἔφη τοιούτοισι γυναῖκας δωρέεσθαι ἀλλ' οὐ
στρατιῇ. ὁ δὲ Ἀρκεσίλεως τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἐὼν ἐν Σάμῳ 163
συνήγειρε πάντα ἄνδρα ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναδασμῷ· συλλεγομένου δὲ
στρατοῦ πολλοῦ, ἐστάλη ἐς Δελφοὺς Ἀρκεσίλεως χρησόμενος
τῷ χρηστηρίῳ περὶ κατόδου. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ τάδε. "ἐπὶ
μὲν τέσσερας Βάττους καὶ Ἀρκεσίλεως τέσσερας, ὀκτὼ ἀνδρῶν
γενεάς, διδοῖ ὑμῖν Λοξίης βασιλεύειν Κυρήνης, πλέον μέντοι τούτου
οὐδὲ πειρᾶσθαι παραινέει. σὺ μέντοι ἥσυχος εἶναι κατελθὼν
ἐς τὴν σεωυτοῦ. ἢν δὲ τὴν κάμινον εὕρῃς πλέην ἀμφορέων,
μὴ ἐξοπτήσῃς τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἀλλ' ἀπόπεμπε κατ' οὖρον· εἰ δὲ
ἐξοπτήσῃς τὴν κάμινον, μὴ ἐσέλθῃς ἐς τὴν ἀμφίρρυτον· εἰ δὲ
μὴ ἀποθανέαι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ταῦρος ὁ καλλιστεύων." ταῦτα ἡ 164
Πυθίη Ἀρκεσίλεῳ χρᾷ. ὁ δὲ παραλαβὼν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Σάμου
κατῆλθε ἐς τὴν Κυρήνην, καὶ ἐπικρατήσας τῶν πρηγμάτων τοῦ
μαντηίου οὐκ ἐμέμνητο, ἀλλὰ δίκας τοὺς ἀντιστασιώτας αἴτεε
τῆς ἑωυτοῦ φυγῆς. τῶν δὲ οἱ μὲν τὸ παράπαν ἐκ τῆς χώρης
ἀπαλλάσσοντο, τοὺς δέ τινας χειρωσάμενος ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως ἐς
Κύπρον ἀπέστειλε ἐπὶ διαφθορῇ. τούτους μέν νυν Κνίδιοι

---

163. 1. **τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον.** It may be conjectured that Arkesilaos and Pheretime went together as far as Samos, and there parted, he for Delphi, she to Salamis, perhaps to meet again at Samos before their return to Kyrene (c. 164).

2. **πάντα ἄνδρα.** Women were not wanted. The men enlisted would not necessarily be all Samians.

Rawlinson's contention that ἀναδασμὸς need not mean a new re-division is supported by the use of ἀναδαιομένας in the oracle c. 159 *supra*. The land was to be taken, as in the former case, from the Libyans. This oracle is in part, assuming the authenticity of the text, a *vaticinium post eventum*. If such an oracle had been extant in 466 B.C. Pindar would hardly have written in that year: παισὶ τούτοις ὄγδοον θάλλει μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας, *Pyth.* 4. 115. Arkesilaos IV. must have been deposed about or before 460 B.C., see Appendix XII., Introduction, § 17, and Hdt. cannot have acquired this material until some time after that event. The oracle has been reduced to prose again, but the hexametric terminations are easily detected: Κυρήνης βασιλεύειν—ἥσυχος εἶναι—ἀπόπεμπε κατ' οὖρον—ἐς τὴν ἀμφίρρυτον ἔλθῃς—ταῦρος ὁ καλλιστεύων. These tags do not touch the "four Batti and four Arkesilai," or the eight generations. On the confusion of reigns and generations cp. c. 147 *supra*.

164. 3. **ἐπικρατήσας.** Cp. τῆς Σαλαμῖνος ἐπεκράτεε c. 162 *supra*, the difference of sense is not solely due to the difference of tense.

τοῦ μαντηίου. Given in the preceding c.

5. **οἱ μέν.** Others going no farther than Barka. Cp. l. 18 *infra*.

6. **ἐς Κύπρον.** Although Evelthon had not supported him. Σάμον would offer no difficulty. The captives might have been destroyed without being sent to Kypros. Perhaps he sent them away from Kyrene without intending that they should arrive at Kypros. Anyway they were released at Knidos and despatched to Thera. Stein ascribes the action of the Knidians to their Dorian kinship with the Kyreneans, Knidos being a colony from Lakedaimon 1. 174, like Thera, the metropolis of Kyrene: but is the kinship certain? It was remote, if not fictitious: and even the recognition of a common metropolis would not have counted for much against diverse political interests. Opposition to the dynastic intrigues between the tyrants of Samos and Kyrene might help to explain the rescue.

ἀπενειχθέντας πρὸς τὴν σφετέρην ἐρρύσαντο καὶ ἐς Θήρην ἀπέστειλαν· ἑτέρους δέ τινας τῶν Κυρηναίων ἐς πύργον μέγαν Ἀγλωμάχου καταφυγόντας ἰδιωτικὸν ὕλην περινήσας ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως ἐνέπρησε. μαθὼν δὲ ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένοισι τὸ μαντήιον ἐὸν τοῦτο, ὅτι μιν ἡ Πυθίη οὐκ ἔα εὑρόντα ἐν τῇ καμίνῳ τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἐξοπτῆσαι, ἔργετο ἑκὼν τῆς τῶν Κυρηναίων πόλιος, δειμαίνων τε τὸν κεχρησμένον θάνατον καὶ δοκέων ἀμφίρρυτον τὴν Κυρήνην εἶναι. εἶχε δὲ γυναῖκα συγγενέα ἑωυτοῦ, θυγατέρα δὲ τῶν Βαρκαίων τοῦ βασιλέος, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Ἀλάζειρ· παρὰ τοῦτον ἀπικνέεται, καί μιν Βαρκαῖοί τε ἄνδρες καὶ τῶν ἐκ Κυρήνης φυγάδων τινὲς καταμαθόντες ἀγοράζοντα κτείνουσι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὸν πενθερὸν αὐτοῦ Ἀλάζειρα. Ἀρκεσίλεως μέν νυν εἴτε ἑκὼν εἴτε ἀέκων ἁμαρτὼν τοῦ χρησμοῦ ἐξέπλησε μοῖραν τὴν ἑωυτοῦ.

165 Ἡ δὲ μήτηρ Φερετίμη, ἕως μὲν ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως ἐν τῇ Βάρκῃ διαιτᾶτο ἐξεργασμένος ἑωυτῷ κακόν, ἡ δὲ εἶχε αὐτὴ τοῦ παιδὸς

---

9. **πύργον Ἀγλωμάχου ἰδιωτικόν.** For private persons to have fortified houses was perhaps an aristocratic 'note': Aristot. *Pol.* 4. 11, 5, 1330ᵇ.

11. **ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένοισι.** 8. 94, 9. 77.

13. **ἔργετο.** As in 7. 197 *ad fin.*, cp. ἔργεσθαι 5. 57.

14. **ἀμφίρρυτον.** Whether he was mistaken in his interpretation Hdt. does not say: the sequel would rather incline us to suppose that Barka, or the market-place in Barka, must have been intended; but Barka had even less claim than Kyrene to be regarded as ἀμφίρρυτος. Cp. Rawlinson. In c. 156 *supra* Kyrene is compared to an *island* (in size).

15. **γυναῖκα . . Ἀλάζειρ.** The commentators make a difficulty out of Alazeir's daughter being a συγγενής of her husband Arkesilaos, and Rawlinson infers from the name that Barka was under a native dynasty, and that Alazeir's daughter was related to Arkesilaos on the mother's side. This is unnecessary. Alazeir, or Aladdeir (cp. Baehr, *ad l.*), though a Libyan name, or title, may have designated an Hellenic, a Battiad prince; and there were certainly Battiadae in Barka, as we see from c. 202 *infra*. Reconciliation had been effected between the two branches of the Battiadae, if there had ever been a quarrel.

165. 1. **ἕως μέν.** Some time was occupied by the transactions just narrated, cc. 162-164. At the date of Arkesilaos' exile (c. 162), Polykrates was alive, and Egypt probably still independent: at the time of Arkesilaos' death, Egypt had been conquered by Kambyses, and Kambyses was perhaps already dead, having meanwhile received the submission of Arkesilaos, and of Kyrene. This 'medism' must have taken place during the interval covered by the narrative in c. 164, and this consideration shows us how artificial and incomplete the narrative is, and how much Hdt. is at the mercy of his pragmatic sources. As often happens, however, Hdt.'s text contains in itself a possible solution of the difficulty. Pheretime pleads in Egypt that her son has perished διὰ τὸν μηδισμόν. Hdt. himself asserts that Arkesilaos III. surrendered Kyrene to Kambyses and paid tribute. Have we here then one of the true reasons of his death, and of the death of his father-in-law Alazeir in Barka, if not the true reason of his flight from Kyrene, ascribed in c. 164 to his superstition?—That Pheretime applies to Aryandes proves that Kambyses had already left Egypt: the expedition presently despatched by Aryandes, in answer to the prayer of Pheretime, is *ex hypothesi* synchronous with the Scythian expedition of Dareios (c. 145 *supra*).

τὰ γέρεα ἐν Κυρήνῃ καὶ τἆλλα νεμομένη καὶ ἐν βουλῇ παρίζουσα· ἐπείτε δὲ ἔμαθε ἐν τῇ Βάρκῃ ἀποθανόντα οἱ τὸν παῖδα, φεύγουσα οἰχώκεε ἐς Αἴγυπτον. ἦσαν γάρ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρκεσίλεω εὐεργεσίαι ἐς Καμβύσεα τὸν Κύρου πεποιημέναι· οὗτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεως ὃς Κυρήνην Καμβύσῃ ἔδωκε καὶ φόρον ἐτάξατο. ἀπικομένη δὲ ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἡ Φερετίμη Ἀρυάνδεω ἱκέτις ἵζετο, τιμωρῆσαι ἑωυτῇ κελεύουσα, προϊσχομένη πρόφασιν ὡς διὰ τὸν μηδισμὸν ὁ παῖς οἱ τέθνηκε.

166 ὁ δὲ Ἀρυάνδης ἦν οὗτος τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὕπαρχος ὑπὸ Καμβύσεω κατεστεώς, ὃς ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ τούτων παρισούμενος Δαρείῳ διεφθάρη. πυθόμενος γὰρ καὶ ἰδὼν Δαρεῖον ἐπιθυμέοντα μνημόσυνον ἑωυτοῦ λιπέσθαι τοῦτο τὸ μὴ ἄλλῳ εἴη βασιλέι κατεργασμένον, ἐμιμέετο τοῦτον, ἐς οὗ ἔλαβε τὸν μισθόν. Δαρεῖος μὲν γὰρ χρυσίον καθαρώτατον ἀπεψήσας ἐς τὸ δυνατώτατον νόμισμα ἐκόψατο, Ἀρυάνδης δὲ ἄρχων Αἰγύπτου ἀργύριον τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίεε, καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ ἀργύριον καθαρώτατον τὸ Ἀρυανδικόν. μαθὼν δέ μιν Δαρεῖος ταῦτα ποιεῦντα, αἰτίην οἱ ἄλλην ἐπενείκας ὥς οἱ ἐπανίσταιτο, ἀπέκτεινε.

167 τότε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Ἀρυάνδης κατοικτείρας Φερετίμην διδοῖ αὐτῇ στρατὸν τὸν ἐξ

---

166. 2. **ὃς ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ.** Digression on the subsequent fate of Aryandes. The appointment of Aryandes is not mentioned in Bk. 3. The unfortunate absence of chronological exactitude prevents our fixing a date for the fall of Aryandes. Cp. Appendix XII.

7. **ἐκόψατο.** The Middle in full force: cp. γραψάμενος c. 88 *supra*, etc.

Αἰγύπτου. Egypt had no native coinage: and "it was not until after the conquest of that country by Alexander the Great (330 B.C.) that money was there struck for the first time," Ridgway, *Origin of Currency*, p. 219 (where this reference should be added to the note on the Persian issue).

8. **νῦν.** Undoubtedly at the date when our author was writing this passage: but what was that? Cp. Introduction, § 16, I.

9. **αἰτίην.** The offence of Aryandes was apparently a double one (1) coining, (2) disturbing the relations of the imperial coinage by the extreme purity of his silver. Rawlinson argues that there would be no need of any other charge; but as Blakesley points out the position of Dareios was long insecure, and the story of Oroetes 3. 127 f. suggests that roundabout methods were employed for suppressing formidable satraps. However the ἄλλη αἰτίη was probably the true one, as the mere coinage of *silver* was probably not an offence, though the coinage of *gold* would have been high treason. (Cp. Gardner, *Types*, pp. 8, 26, B. Head, *Historia*, 699 f.) As usual Hdt. is complete master of the king's mind (cp. c. 1 *supra*), but the logic of the passage is not very close: the coinage might have been taken as a *symptom* of a rebellious intention. In Hdt.'s conception, perhaps, Dareios was *jealous* of the purity of the satrap's silver. No *Aryandics* have been as yet identified by the numismatists, B. Head, *l.c.*

167. 1. **τότε.** Opposed to ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ previous c. *ad init.*

2. **κατοικτείρας.** There was probably as much of policy as of pity in it: nor is it likely that the mission of the Herald was confined to the bare question given below; anyway our author quickly enlarges the project of Aryandes into a wholesale conquest of Libya. In this consideration he finds an excuse for the excursus on the Libyans, their land and life, which follows (cc. 168-199). Cp. n. c. 145 *supra*, and Introduction, p. xxxii.

στρατὸν . . ἅπαντα. That Egypt was left literally denuded of soldiers is not likely, but the supposed scale of the

Αἰγύπτου ἅπαντα καὶ τὸν πεζὸν καὶ τὸν ναυτικόν· στρατηγὸν δὲ τοῦ μὲν πεζοῦ Ἄμασιν ἀπέδεξε ἄνδρα Μαράφιον, τοῦ δὲ ναυτικοῦ Βάδρην ἐόντα Πασαργάδην γένος. πρὶν δὲ ἢ ἀποστεῖλαι τὴν στρατιήν, ὁ Ἀρυάνδης πέμψας ἐς τὴν Βάρκην κήρυκα ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη ὁ Ἀρκεσίλεων ἀποκτείνας. οἱ δὲ Βαρκαῖοι αὐτοὶ ὑπεδέκοντο πάντες· πολλά τε γὰρ καὶ κακὰ πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. πυθόμενος δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἀρυάνδης οὕτω δὴ τὴν στρατιὴν ἀπέστειλε ἅμα τῇ Φερετίμῃ. αὕτη μέν νυν αἰτίη πρόσχημα τοῦ στόλου ἐγίνετο, ἀπεπέμπετο δὲ ἡ στρατιή, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐπὶ Λιβύης καταστροφῇ. Λιβύων γὰρ δὴ ἔθνεα πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ὀλίγα βασιλέος ἦν ὑπήκοα, τὰ δὲ πλέω ἐφρόντιζε [Δαρείου] οὐδέν.

168 Οἰκέουσι δὲ κατὰ τάδε Λίβυες. ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀρξάμενοι

---

expedition swells the triumph of the Greeks in Libya.

3. **ναυτικόν.** The employment of the fleet, if indeed there was a fleet, is noticeable: information as to its composition would have been interesting; the rather, as another fleet was *ex hypothesi* serving against Scythia. The ships may have been manned by native Egyptians, cp. 7. 89, or the vessels may have been Phoenician, cp. 3. 17, 19. It is not inconceivable that some Greeks may have served; in any case the command is in the hands of a Persian, cp. 7. 97. Such divided and coequal commands were not calculated to ensure success, cp. the anecdote c. 203 *infra*, and the case of the Naxian expedition, 5. 32, 33. Were there other Persians in the force beside the commanders? Cp. 200 *infra*. Both commanders are Persians, though one has an Egyptian name, which is remarkable, and even suspicious. On Maraphii and Pasargadae, cp. 1. 125. Polyaenus, 7. 28, reports a siege of Barke by a Persian Arsames, who may be the Amasis of this passage, but the circumstances are different (see Appendix XII.).

8. **πάσχειν.** Yet according to the obviously imperfect story of his conduct (cc. 162-164) the Barkaians had nothing much to complain of. *Δαρ. secl.* Stein.

168. 1. **οἰκέουσι δὲ κτλ.** There follows here an excursus (cc. 168-199) on the ethnography and geography of Libya. It falls obviously into three main parts, the first (cc. 168-180), on the coast-tribes between Egypt and "Lake Tritonis": the second (cc. 181-190), on the parallel belt of Oases inland: the third (cc. 191-196) on Western Libya. The remaining passages of the excursus (cc. 197, 198, 199) contain some general remarks, and bring the historian back to Kyrene. What relation this excursus, which is apparently from a source or sources other than the preceding and succeeding history of Kyrene, bears to other parts of Hdt.'s work, and whether all portions of the excursus were composed and inserted at the same time, are questions which must be raised, even if no definite answers are forthcoming, cp. Appendix XII. Blakesley has suggested that Hdt.'s information is based on "merchants' stories," and further discriminates between the information gained by *coasting* traders (cc. 168-180) and the information based on *caravans* (cc. 181 ff.). This suggestion obviously corresponds to the character of the material. It does not follow that Hdt. collected information or compiled results from these different sources at one time or in one place, nor that this ethnographic excursus was part of his original draft of the Persian dealings with Kyrene. It appears on internal evidence to have been written (or revised) not merely after his visit to Egypt (cc. 168, 180, 181, 186), but also after his settlement in Thurii (cp. c. 195 *infra*). If the passage (cc. 168-180) might have been composed from information collected in Egypt (cp. 2. 32, 33), the last portion of the excursus (cc. 191-196, or 199) has the appearance of being derived from western (Italiot, Sikeliot) sources. The

πρῶτοι Ἀδυρμαχίδαι Λιβύων κατοίκηνται, οἳ νόμοισι μὲν τὰ πλέω Αἰγυπτίοισι χρέωνται, ἐσθῆτα δὲ φορέουσι οἵην περ οἱ ἄλλοι Λίβυες. αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν ψέλιον περὶ ἑκατέρῃ τῶν κνημέων φορέουσι χάλκεον· τὰς κεφαλὰς δὲ κομῶσαι, τοὺς φθεῖρας ἐπεὰν λάβωσι τοὺς ἑωυτῆς ἑκάστη ἀντιδάκνει καὶ οὕτω ῥίπτει. οὗτοι δὲ μοῦνοι Λιβύων τοῦτο ἐργάζονται, καὶ τῷ βασιλέι μοῦνοι τὰς παρθένους μελλούσας συνοικέειν ἐπιδεικνύουσι· ἣ δὲ ἂν τῷ βασιλέι ἀρεστὴ γένηται, ὑπὸ τούτου διαπαρθενεύεται. παρήκουσι δὲ οὗτοι οἱ Ἀδυρμαχίδαι ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου μέχρι λιμένος τῷ οὔνομα Πλυνός ἐστι. τούτων δὲ ἔχονται Γιλιγάμαι, νεμόμενοι 169

---

passage on the Oases (cc. 181-185), starting as it does from Egypt, may be thought to be due to an Egyptian (Graeco-Eg.) source: but the great geographical blunder by which the parallel of Thebes is substituted for that of Memphis, the excessive symmetry in the oases and zones, and the zone-theory itself point to western ideas. (Cp. Appendix XII.) It must also be remembered that Hdt. was not the first author who described Libya in prose.

1. **ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου** (cp. c. 17 *supra* ἀπὸ τοῦ Βορυσθενειτέων κτλ.). ἀρξάμενοι is here *de trop*. The Adyrmachidae are mentioned by Skylax, Strabo and others, and placed by them in substantially the same position as by Hdt. As Hdt. however does not mention the Marmaridae, the chief tribe in these parts according to Skylax, Strabo, and Ptolemy, Rawlinson would identify them with the Giligammae. See next c.

2. **τὰ πλέω Αἰγυπτίοισι.** Skylax places the Adyrmachidae within the Egyptian frontier (*Geogr. min.* i. p. 81), making Libya begin from the Kanobic mouth of the Nile: even so, we may suspect that the Egyptian influence is overstated, if the habits described were really still in force.

3. **ἐσθῆτα.** In 7. 71, Hdt. mentions that the Libyans wore skins: V. de Saint-Martin, *Le Nord de l'Afrique*, p. 42 n. cites Pomp. Mela, 1. 8, primores sagis velantur, vulgus bestiarum pecudumque pellibus.

5. **κομῶσαι.** Hair-dressing had some national and political significance even for Hellenes. Cp. Becker and Göll, *Charikles*, xi. iii. (vol. iii. pp. 297 ff.), and cc. 175, 178, 180, 191 *infra*.

6. **ἀντιδάκνει . . ῥίπτει.** 'Bites them before throwing them away.' On lice-eating cp. c. 109 *supra*.

8. **βασιλέι,** 'chief.' With his reputed privilege Baehr and Rawlinson compare the mediaeval *Droit de cuissage* or *de culage* (*ius primae noctis*). See references in Baehr: Saint-Martin adds that the custom still obtains among Berbers south of Atlas, *op. c.* p. 43. Cp. also Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, pp. 72 ff., p. 539.

11. **Πλυνός.** There is some doubt about the identity of this place. Skylax (*op. c.* p. 82, § 108), places it two days' sail west of Apis, which with him marks the western limit of Egypt and of the Adyrmachidae. Rawlinson admits the identification with the Panormos of Ptolemy = Port Bardeah. (Ptol. 4. 5, 4). R. Neumann (*Nordafrika nach Herodot.* 1892) remarks that the great Katabathmos (Akabet el Kabira) would form a natural frontier and support Hdt. against Skylax, but is also prepared to allow that each may have been right in his own time. (Hdt. does not in general allow for any changes between his own time and the time of the story, cp. Introduction, p. lv.)

169. 1. **Γιλιγάμαι** is a form restored from Steph. Byz. The MSS. vary between τιλιγάμμαι, γιγάμαι, γηγάμαι (γεγάμαι, as quoted in note to Steph. B. ed. Berkelio). One editor of Steph. B. gives Γιλιγάμβαι. "Pour un nom dont la synonymie est encore inconnue, il est bon de recueillir les variantes" (Saint-Martin). The name is not found except as apparently quoted from Hdt. The locality corresponds to the Marmarica of Ptolemy, occupied by several small tribes. The *Periplus* of Skylax places the Marmaridae next the Adyrmachidae and extends them to Hesperides. Rawlinson identifies the Giligamae with the Marmaridae:

τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρην [χώρην] μέχρι Ἀφροδισιάδος νήσου. ἐν δὲ τῷ
μεταξὺ τούτου [χώρῳ] ἥ τε Πλατέα νῆσος ἐπικέεται, τὴν ἔκτισαν
οἱ Κυρηναῖοι, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ Μενέλαος λιμήν ἐστι καὶ Ἄζιρις,
τὴν οἱ Κυρηναῖοι οἴκεον, καὶ τὸ σίλφιον ἄρχεται ἀπὸ τούτου·
παρήκει δὲ ἀπὸ Πλατέης νήσου μέχρι τοῦ στόματος τῆς Σύρτιος
τὸ σίλφιον. νόμοισι δὲ χρέωνται οὗτοι παραπλησίοισι τοῖσι
170 ἑτέροισι. Γιλιγαμέων δὲ ἔχονται τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης Ἀσβύσται·
οὗτοι ὑπὲρ Κυρήνης οἰκέουσι. ἐπὶ θάλασσαν δὲ οὐ κατήκουσι
Ἀσβύσται· τὸ γὰρ παρὰ θάλασσαν Κυρηναῖοι νέμονται.
τεθριπποβάται δὲ οὐκ ἥκιστα ἀλλὰ μάλιστα Λιβύων εἰσί,
νόμους δὲ τοὺς πλεῦνας μιμέεσθαι ἐπιτηδεύουσι τοὺς Κυρηναίων.

Saint-Martin suggests that in the word *Marmaridae* we have the name of the *Berbers*. R. Neumann suggests that Adyrmachidae and Giligammae (*sic*) are subdivisions of Marmaridae (*op. c.* p. 13)—a remark favoured by the statement regarding their νόμοι, *infra*.

2. **ἐν τῷ μεταξύ.** Between Plynos and Aphrodisias. χώρην *bis secl.* Stein. The island Aphrodisias is identified by Rawlinson with Leia, a small island due north of Kyrene, off Apollonia. To the east lie Aziris, Platea, Portus Menelaos. According to Skylax, Menelaos is two days' sail west of Plynos: from Menelaos to Platea (Πλατεῖαι) upwards of two days. Whether Hdt. correctly conceives the order of the places named is not apparent, owing to his mentioning first the islands, and then the places on the mainland. Menelaos, Platea, Aziris, Aphrodisias represents the order from E. to W. On Aziris cp. c. 157 *supra*. The name Menelaos suggests a tradition which would carry the acquaintance of the Hellenes with Libya back into Heroic times. Cp. 2. 118, *Od.* 4. 351 ff.

5. **τὸ σίλφιον.** Too well-known in the historian's time to require description, hence the article; as we might say 'the potato,' 'the tobacco-plant.' The wealth of Kyrene and the Battiads was largely due to the export of this simple, valuable as a drug and as a condiment. Cp. the proverb τὸ Βάττου σίλφιον Aristoph. *Plutus* 925, and Schol. *ad l.* It appears on the coins of Kyrene and Barka (*vid.* Gardner, *Types*, P. iii. 27, ix. 29, 30). In Pliny's time it was extinct at Cyrene though still found elsewhere (*Nat. H.* 22. 48). Strabo mentions its malicious destruction by the nomads 837. It is believed to exist now in the Cyrenaica as *drias*, in a degenerate form. See further notes *ad l.* in Baehr and Rawlinson, R. Neumann, *op. c.* pp. 146-151. The name was probably Libyan (sliph), cp. Studniczka, *Kyrene*, pp. 7, 12.

6. **τοῦ στόματος τ. Σ.** What can 'the mouth of the Syrtis' mean? Rawlinson (*ad l.*) recognises that Hdt. knows of but one Syrtis, the Greater; the expression here used generates an idea that Hdt. thought vaguely of the Syrtis as a *river*. The phraseology here and in c. 173 *infra*, lends colour to the suggestion. The gender of Σύρτις (ἡ) is against such a notion, but might be paralleled by ἡ Στύξ.

170. 1. **ἔχονται.** Cp. 5. 49.

2. **ὑπέρ,** 'to the south of'—marks the writer's point of view, as that of Greeks, it might be in Kyrene, or in Europe. The form **Ἀσβύσται** is supported by Kallimachos (of Kyrene) Hymn to Apollo, 766 Ἀσβυστὶς γαῖα, and by Steph. Byz. Saint-Martin suggests that the tribe survives in the Gezbida, a division of the Tibou, in the desert east of Fezzan, to which they were presumably driven by the Arab conquerors. In the historian's time the Asbystae appear as the tribe most affected by the Hellenic colony: they perhaps supplied the *Perioikoi* mentioned cc. 159, 161 *supra*.

4. **τεθριπποβάται.** Hdt. does not say here that they learnt the practice from the Greeks, and in c. 189 *infra* he makes exactly the opposite statement: see note *ad l.*

Ἀσβυστέων δὲ ἔχονται τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης Αὐσχίσαι· οὗτοι ὑπὲρ 171
Βάρκης οἰκέουσι, κατήκοντες ἐπὶ θάλασσαν κατ᾽ Εὐεσπερίδας. Αὐσχισέων δὲ κατὰ μέσον τῆς χώρης οἰκέουσι Βάκαλες, ὀλίγον ἔθνος, κατήκοντες ἐπὶ θάλασσαν κατὰ Ταύχειρα πόλιν τῆς Βαρκαίης· νόμοισι δὲ τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι χρέωνται τοῖσι καὶ οἱ ὑπὲρ Κυρήνης. Αὐσχισέων δὲ τούτων τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης ἔχονται 172
Νασαμῶνες, ἔθνος ἐὸν πολλόν, οἳ τὸ θέρος καταλείποντες ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὰ πρόβατα ἀναβαίνουσι ἐς Αὔγιλα χῶρον ὀπωριεῦντες τοὺς φοίνικας· οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀμφιλαφέες πεφύκασι, πάντες ἐόντες καρποφόροι. τοὺς δὲ ἀττελέβους ἐπεὰν θηρεύσωσι,

---

171. 1. **Αὐσχίσαι.** The sites of Barka, Euhesperides, Tauchira and Kyrene which are all ascertained, and exhibited on the proper maps, define the position of the Auschisae (Auschitae, Steph. B.). V. de Saint-Martin compares the Outchtata, a berber tribe located on the Syrtes by the Arabian historian Ibn Khaldoun.

3. **Βάκαλες.** There is a respectable variant Κάβαλες (which Holder adopts): Rawlinson identifies them with the Cabyles of Algeria: Ptolemy 4. 7, 35 has a district Βακαλῖτις in Aethiopia.

5. **χρέωνται.** Subject is Αὐσχίσαι.

172. 2. **Νασαμῶνες.** The Nasamones were evidently one of the most important and best known of the Libyan tribes, and the ancient geographers agree generally in the position assigned to them. (See Rawlinson *ad l.*) The Romans, however, appear to have wished to push them inland, or at least to chastise them for their 'wrecking' practices. (Vastae Nasamon populator Syrtis, Sil. Italic. 1. 408. Cp. Lucan 9. 432 ff.) Josephus and Eusebius record Roman expeditions against them (*Bell. Jud.* 2. 16, *Chron.* p. 378, ed. Maio). Saint-Martin (to whom the above references are due) argues from Ptolemy 4. 5, 21, 30 that in Ptolemy's time the Nasamones were diminished and confined to the interior. They are mentioned (he adds) in the middle of the 6th century in the *Johannis* of Corippus as rising against the dominion of Constantinople with numerous other Libyan tribes under native chiefs. A little later they pass under the Arab dominion, and Saint-Martin finds them again in the *Nefzâwa* of the writers, especially Ibn Khaldoun (end of 14th century), a name comprising a number of berber tribes south and west of the Syrtes.

3. **Αὔγιλα**, one of the best ascertained spots in the Herodotean geography of Libya, the name and place remaining unchanged to the present day. Hornemann was the first European who visited the Audjelah, in 1798, apparently without describing it in detail; Pacho visited it in 1825 and guarantees the fidelity of Hdt.'s description; Hamilton (*Wanderings in North Africa*, 1856, c. xiv.) describes Angila (*sic*) and thinks that the name formerly included a group of oases, the most important of which is Jalo, 28 miles or eight hours E.S.E. from Augila (*op. c.* p. 191). The date is still the staple of the country.

ὀπωριεῦντες, future. c. 182 *infra*.

5. **ἀττελέβους**, Attic ἀττέλαβος, "a kind of locust without wings" L. & S. Cp. Pliny, *Nat. H.* 29. 29 locustarum minimae sine pennis quos attelabos vocant. Locusts are specified as lawful food for Muhammadans. (Hughes' *Notes on Muhammadanism*², p. 144.) Arrian, *Indica*, 29, describes a preparation of dried fish similar to that here described (cit. *apud* Baehr). ἐπὶ seems superfluous, and inelegant (ἔπειτα ἐπὶ ἐπιπάσσοντες). If it is retained with β (Holder) against α it is of course to be understood *in tmesi*. The marriage customs are probably not quite accurately described by Herodotus: in fact the passage which follows is not free from confusion. Polygamy and Promiscuity are hardly reconcilable, and the ceremony, paralleled from the practice of the Massagetae (1. 216), suggests rather polyandry than polygyny. The marriage custom further specified (πρῶτον μὲν κτλ.) also resembles a polyandrous custom. Strabo 783 (*apud*

αὐήναντες πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον καταλέουσι καὶ ἔπειτα ἐπὶ γάλα ἐπιπάσσοντες πίνουσι. γυναῖκας δὲ νομίζοντες πολλὰς ἔχειν ἕκαστος ἐπίκοινον αὐτέων τὴν μῖξιν ποιεῦνται τρόπῳ παραπλησίῳ τῷ καὶ Μασσαγέται· ἐπεὰν σκίπωνα προστήσωνται, μίσγονται. πρῶτον δὲ γαμέοντος Νασαμῶνος ἀνδρὸς νόμος ἐστὶ τὴν νύμφην νυκτὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διὰ πάντων διεξελθεῖν τῶν δαιτυμόνων μισγομένην· τῶν δὲ ὡς ἕκαστός οἱ μιχθῇ, διδοῖ δῶρον τὸ ἂν ἔχῃ φερόμενος ἐξ οἴκου. ὁρκίοισι δὲ καὶ μαντικῇ χρέωνται τοιῇδε· ὀμνύουσι μὲν τοὺς παρὰ σφίσι ἄνδρας δικαιοτάτους καὶ ἀρίστους λεγομένους γενέσθαι, τούτους, τῶν τύμβων ἁπτόμενοι· μαντεύονται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων φοιτέοντες τὰ σήματα, καὶ κατευξάμενοι ἐπικατακοιμῶνται· τὸ δ' ἂν ἴδῃ ἐν τῇ ὄψι ἐνύπνιον, τούτῳ χρᾶται. πίστισι δὲ τοιῇσιδε χρέωνται· ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς διδοῖ πιεῖν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ἑτέρου πίνει· ἢν δὲ μὴ ἔχωσι ὑγρὸν μηδέν, οἱ δὲ τῆς χαμᾶθεν σποδοῦ λαβόντες λείχουσι.

173 *Νασαμῶσι δὲ προσόμουροί εἰσι Ψύλλοι. οὗτοι ἐξαπολώλασι τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· ὁ νότος σφι πνέων ἄνεμος τὰ ἔλυτρα τῶν ὑδάτων ἐξηύηνε, ἡ δὲ χώρη σφι ἅπασα ἐντὸς ἐοῦσα τῆς Σύρτιος ἦν ἄνυδρος·*

Baehr) mentions a similar practice among the Arabians. Cp. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 133. The three particulars mentioned by Hdt. reduce themselves to a misconception of a community of wives, or of a wife, among a (small) number of kinsmen, instances of which are common. It is possible, however, to combine practices of polyandry and polygyny: "a Nair may be in one of several combinations of husbands": see further, H. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology* (vol. i. pt. iii. cc. iii.-viii.) and Westermarck, *op. cit.* cc. iv. v. and esp. p. 72.

9. **προστήσωνται**, *sc.* *οἰκίας, καλύβης*. In 1. 216 *πρὸ τῆς ἁμάξης*. The absence of the concrete in this passage betrays perhaps the indefiniteness of Hdt.'s authority. Or are the words *ἐπεὰν . . μίσγονται* a mere gloss?

13. **ὁρκίοισι δὲ καὶ μαντικῇ.** Their oaths and mantic seem to point to Ancestor worship, or its rudiments, and to belong to a higher stratum of custom than the marriage institutions just described. The *Augilae* had the credit with the ancients of worshipping only the *Manes* or *Inferi*: Augilae manes tantum deos putant, Mela, 1. 8, 55; Augilae inferos tantum colunt, Pliny, *Nat. H.* 5. 8 (Baehr).

18. **ἐκ τῆς χειρός.** Shaw, *Voyage*, i. 393 (Baehr) records a similar custom obtaining in the marriage ceremony in Algiers.

20. **σποδοῦ.** "The Mahometan law of ablution allows sand to be used where water cannot be procured," Rawlinson.

173. 1. **προσόμουροί εἰσι** and **ἐξαπολώλασι** constitute a contradiction: that the fault lies with the latter term seems demonstrated by the frequent mention of the Psylli in subsequent authors, esp. Strabo: and that Hdt. himself does not believe in their extermination seems indicated in his quasi-reference to the source of the statement *λέγω δὲ ταῦτα τὰ λέγουσι Λίβυες*. Cp. Introduction, § 22. According to Pliny (7. 2) it was the Nasamones (not the Notos) which nearly exterminated the Psylli. Rawlinson rationalises the story by combining the wind and the Nasamones. The tribe of Psylli was specially renowned for snake-charming. Pliny, *loc. c.* Aelian, *de nat. an.* 16. 27.

3. **ἐντὸς τῆς Σύρτιος.** Cp. *ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ* 1. 6, *μέχρι τοῦ στόματος τῆς Σύρτιος* c. 169 *supra* and note. The gender of *Σύρτις* would forbid the addition of *ποταμὸς* here. In any case *ἐντὸς* is equivalent to 'East of . . .' in this passage: the writer is proceeding west-

οἱ δὲ βουλευσάμενοι κοινῷ λόγῳ ἐστρατεύοντο ἐπὶ τὸν νότον (λέγω δὲ ταῦτα τὰ λέγουσι Λίβυες), καὶ ἐπείτε ἐγίνοντο ἐν τῇ ψάμμῳ, πνεύσας ὁ νότος κατέχωσέ σφεας. ἐξαπολομένων δὲ τούτων ἔχουσι τὴν χώρην οἱ Νασαμῶνες.

Τούτων δὲ κατύπερθε πρὸς νότον ἄνεμον ἐν τῇ θηριώδεϊ 174
οἰκέουσι Γαράμαντες, οἳ πάντα ἄνθρωπον φεύγουσι καὶ παντὸς
ὁμιλίην, καὶ οὔτε ὅπλον ἐκτέαται ἀρήιον οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀμύνεσθαι
ἐπιστέαται. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ κατύπερθε οἰκέουσι Νασαμώνων· 175
τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν ἔχονται τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρης Μάκαι, οἳ λόφους κείρονται, τὸ μὲν μέσον τῶν τριχῶν ἀνιέντες αὔξεσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν κείροντες ἐν χροΐ, ἐς δὲ τὸν πόλεμον στρουθῶν καταγαίων δορὰς φορέουσι προβλήματα. διὰ δὲ αὐτῶν Κῖνυψ ποταμὸς ῥέων ἐκ λόφου καλευμένου Χαρίτων ἐς

---

wards. The Psylli are placed east of the Nasamones by Strabo, 838. Maps erroneously place them to the west, as though *ἐντὸς* here merely meant south, or perhaps "not extending (W.) beyond..."

4. **λέγω κτλ.** This phrase is no guarantee that Hdt. had not read the story in the *Periodos* of Hekataios, much less that he had conversed with 'Libyans' on the subject: or with other Greeks, who cited Libyans as their authority. But even 'Libyans' Hdt. might have met in Egypt, or in Sicily, or the west. Cp. 7. 165. The specification of the source here invalidates the testimony. Cp. c. 187 *infra*. Introduction, § 22.

174. 2. **Γαράμαντες.** These Garamantes are a truly pacific folk, who though dwelling *ἐν τῷ θηριώδεϊ* do not know how to defend themselves except by flight. Unfortunately a tribe of Garamantes appears in c. 183 *infra* with very different qualities: are they the same, is the reading correct? Eustathios and Steph. B. both read Garamantes here. Larcher supposes two tribes of the same name but different habits! Pliny and Mela ascribe the pacific peculiarities here predicated of the Garamantes to a tribe of Gamphasantes. R. Neumann would boldly read Gamphasantes here (*op. cit.* pp. 21 ff.). Blakesley conjectures that Hdt. draws from two different sources, and his authority here mistook the Troglodyte Tibboos, who in c. 183 are said to be hunted by the Garamantes, for the hunters. Saint-Martin suggests that the Garamantes here referred to are to be sought in the Wady Gadâma three or four days south of Tripoli. Even if we could make Gadamantes out of this, we should not save the credit of Hdt.'s description of the people, which appears to fit only the Troglodytes c. 183 *infra*. See note *ad l.c.* The conclusion to which we are driven is that Hdt. could make or leave contradictory or inconsequent statements in his text, almost in juxtaposition, without becoming conscious of the trouble he was providing for his friends. No one has ventured to reconcile Hdt.'s statements about the Garamantes by the supposition of a wholesale degeneration, such as the Lydians underwent (1. 79, 155 f.), or by the hypothesis that they are described in this passage from the Greek point of view and in c. 183 from the Troglodyte point of view: such subtleties are less probable than the simple conclusion that Hdt. sometimes blundered, or slumbered.

175. 2. **τὸ δὲ παρὰ θάλασσαν.** The Makae come next to the Nasamones on the littoral.

3. **λόφους κείρονται.** A sort of telic predication: 'so as to produce crests.'

5. **στρουθῶν καταγαίων,** *στροῦθος καταγ.* = *στρουθοκάμηλος*, an ostrich: not now found north of the desert. R. Neumann, *op. c.* p. 160.

6. **Κῖνυψ.** The extraordinary fertility of the Kinyps is celebrated c. 198 *infra*, cp. 5. 42. There is however some difficulty in identifying the river or the Hill of the Graces with any modern features. The Gharian range of mountains is only four or five miles from the sea: the only stream answer-

θάλασσαν ἐκδιδοῖ. ὁ δὲ λόφος οὗτος ὁ Χαρίτων δασὺς ἴδῃσι
ἐστι, ἐούσης τῆς ἄλλης τῆς προκαταλεχθείσης Λιβύης ψιλῆς·
176 ἀπὸ θαλάσσης δὲ ἐς αὐτὸν στάδιοι διηκόσιοί εἰσι. Μακέων δὲ
τούτων ἐχόμενοι Γινδᾶνές εἰσι, τῶν αἱ γυναῖκες περισφύρια
δερμάτων πολλὰ ἑκάστη φορέει κατὰ τοιόνδε τι, ὡς λέγεται·
κατ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον μιχθέντα περισφύριον περιδέεται· ἣ δὲ ἂν
πλεῖστα ἔχῃ, αὕτη ἀρίστη δέδοκται εἶναι ὡς ὑπὸ πλείστων
177 ἀνδρῶν φιληθεῖσα. ἀκτὴν δὲ προέχουσαν ἐς τὸν πόντον
τούτων τῶν Γινδάνων νέμονται Λωτοφάγοι, οἳ τὸν καρπὸν
μοῦνον τοῦ λωτοῦ τρώγοντες ζώουσι. ὁ δὲ τοῦ λωτοῦ καρπός
ἐστι μέγαθος ὅσον τε τῆς σχίνου, γλυκύτητα δὲ τοῦ φοίνικος
τῷ καρπῷ προσείκελος. ποιεῦνται δὲ ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ τούτου οἱ
178 Λωτοφάγοι καὶ οἶνον. Λωτοφάγων δὲ τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν ἔχονται

---

ing to the Kinyps is the Wady Mghr-Ghrin, an insignificant brook. Has the face of nature changed, or was Hdt. ill-informed? The simplest solution is the hypothesis that Hdt. was mistaken, or misinformed, as to the length of the stream. Cp. R. Neumann, *op. c.* p. 25.

176. 2. **Γίνδανες.** With the practice of the Gindanes may be compared certain customs in Thibet as described by Marco Polo, Bk. 2, c. 45 (vol. ii. p. 35, and note[4]. Yule, ed.[2]).

3. **ὡς λέγεται.** Hdt. appears to have doubts in regard to his information. Cp. c. 173 *supra*. Introduction, § 22. It is obvious that the wearing of leathern anklets, or bracelets, may be a fact, though the reason given may be a fiction. Anyway metal would presumably have been worn, if the wearers could have afforded it. Cp. c. 168 *supra*. The Gindanes must have been a poor folk: or was it only the poor among them who wore leather rings?

177. 2. **Λωτοφάγοι.** Lotophagi is obviously only a Greek epithet as old as Homer (*Od.* 9. 84) derived from the staple food of the tribe: the native name is generally supposed to be lost. Pliny, indeed, gives *Alachroae* as the name of the lotos-eaters (*Hist. nat.* 5. 4), and this has been identified with the name of the next tribe mentioned by Hdt., the Machlyes or Machryes (V. de Saint-Martin, *op. c.* p. 54), who also eat the lotos. May we not infer that Hdt. or his authority here has duplicated the lotos-eating Machlyes? Rawlinson, however, seems to identify the Lotophagi with the Gindanes, about whose identity there is some doubt. In any case an epithet has been raised into a separate tribal appellative, cp. cc. 106, 107 *supra*. The country of the Lotophagi is to be recognised in the promontory of Zarzis near the lesser Syrtis (Rawlinson). Neumann's objections, *op. cit.* p. 26, do not touch the topographical identification, but only the supposition that the Lotos-land is to be restricted to the peninsula, of which neither Rawlinson nor even Hdt. is guilty. In 2. 96 the Kyrenaean lotos is described as resembling a thorn-tree: in 2. 92 the Egyptian lotos is described as an edible water-lily. Rawlinson's note enumerates six different plants to which the name was applied: the lotos here referred to he identifies with the *Rhamnus Zizyphus*, which "looks and tastes rather like a bad crab-apple." Hdt. says it is sweet as a date. Perhaps it has degenerated even as the silphium. The passage on the lotos in Rennell, *Geogr. Syst. of Hdt.* ii.[2] pp. 288-299, is worth consulting. Also Excursus I. to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xiii. *ed.* Lemaire, *curante* L. Desfontaines, Paris, 1829.

4. **σχίνου**, lentisk-tree.

6. **καὶ οἶνον.** Pliny 13. 32 (17) describes a paste and a wine, made from the lotos, a description based perhaps in part on the authority of Polybios, direct, or through Cornelius Nepos. Cp. Athenaeus, 651 (= Polyb. xii. ii. ed. Didot, p. 502), who remarks that Polybios had seen the Lotos.

Μάχλυες, τῷ λωτῷ μὲν καὶ οὗτοι χρεώμενοι, ἀτὰρ ἧσσόν γε τῶν προτέρον λεχθέντων, κατήκουσι δὲ ἐπὶ ποταμὸν μέγαν τῷ οὔνομα Τρίτων ἐστί· ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ οὗτος ἐς λίμνην μεγάλην Τριτωνίδα· ἐν δὲ αὐτῇ νῆσος ἔνι τῇ οὔνομα Φλά. ταύτην δὲ τὴν νῆσον Λακεδαιμονίοισί φασι λόγιον εἶναι κτίσαι. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος. 179

---

178. 2. **Μάχλυες.** Saint-Martin identifies the Machlyes with "the large and important Berber tribe of Maghîla" represented in the history of the Arab conquest on the west side of the great Syrtis (*op. cit.* p. 54). Rennell (*op. cit.* ii.² p. 286) ingeniously suggests that the Machlyes ate less Lotos because they were the folk so clever at catching fish as described by Strabo, 835.

3. **κατήκουσι δὲ κτλ.** The geographical details of this c. give rise to considerable difficulties: the first, as to the identification of "Lake Tritonis." This difficulty is obviated by the supposition that the so-called Lake includes (*a*) the lesser Syrtis, unknown or unnamed by Hdt. and (*b*) an inland lake in the neighbourhood, which once communicated with the Syrtis. The name of this lake is given as Shibk-el-Lowdeath (Rawl.), Sibkha-Laoudiah (Saint-Martin), *al.* Chot el-Kebir. A parallel case, of an inland sea called λίμνη, we have in the λίμνη Μαιῆτις. An alternative supposition must be reckoned with, viz. that this passage in the geography of Hdt. is still in the speculative and imaginary stage, and that there is a lake in Libya because a lake is wanted for the procession in c. 180. The second difficulty is more serious, yet more easily disposed of. There is no 'great' stream or river in those parts to-day: there are only rivulets losing themselves in the sands of the lake. Rawlinson endorses Rennell on the subject. (Cp. Rennell, ii.² pp. 335 f.) The river again may be a mythical river, or it may be wanted to divide the Machlyes and Ausees. A third difficulty is created by the oracular island. The island of Phla, if it ever existed, is now part of the sandy tract between the lagoons and the sea. R. Neumann, *op. c.* pp. 28-59, discusses the above problems at length, and though he considers that the data in Hdt. (and Skylax) are too precise and full (*eingehend*) to be mere invention, he proves that the Triton Lake and River cannot be satisfactorily identified with the actual features, that they are bequests of the strictly mythological period, and that the later and better-informed geographers move the Lake on to the Atlantic (Diodoros) or back to Kyrene (Strabo), though Ptolemy, most precise and misleading of all, gives latitude and longitude for Lake and River, very much where Hdt. seems to place them.

6. **φασι,** who? Delphic authorities? Or men of Thera, or of Kyrene, who were concerned to push their interests under Lakedaemonian auspices? Or Sikeliots, who might be dreaming of attacking Carthage on its native soil? In any case the tradition of such an oracle carries us back to the days of Lakedaemonian expansion (cp. 1. 69, 70, 3. 47), before the Spartans were open to the taunts current in Hdt.'s own day, 8. 132 *infra*, for it is hardly explicable as satire.

κτίσαι is mistranslated by Rawl. "were to have colonised." The aor. inf. *κτίσαι* represents the direction of the oracle in the imperative (cp. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 23, note 2). Tr. 'They say the Lacedaemonians were bidden by an oracle colonise this island,' or, 'an oracle, they say, bade the Lacedaemonians colonise this island.'

179. 1. **ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος.** Rawlinson who begins with a mistranslation ("The following is the story as it is commonly told") is content to show, following Grote, from the variety of the modes of bringing Jason to Lake Tritonis, "the unreal and poetic character of the entire narrative." This however does not suggest the significance, the moral, of the poem. Blakesley, n. 463, sees that the mythical story was used to justify actual policy; but he stops short of suggesting that the myth was invented to justify the occupation of Libya. The story of Jason's visit to Libya is told by Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, as of course afterwards by Apollon. Rhod. Cp. *infra*. In Pindar's version of the myth there are two important variants from the version in Hdt. (1) the visit is paid on the way home, whereas in Hdt. the visit is involuntary,

Ἰήσονα, ἐπείτε οἱ ἐξεργάσθη ὑπὸ τῷ Πηλίῳ ἡ Ἀργώ, ἐσθέμενον ἐς αὐτὴν ἄλλην τε ἑκατόμβην, καὶ δὴ καὶ τρίποδα χάλκεον περιπλώειν Πελοπόννησον, βουλόμενον ἐς Δελφοὺς ἀπικέσθαι. καί μιν, ὡς πλέοντα γενέσθαι κατὰ Μαλέην, ὑπολαβεῖν ἄνεμον βορέην καὶ ἀποφέρειν πρὸς τὴν Λιβύην· πρὶν δὲ κατιδέσθαι γῆν, ἐν τοῖσι βράχεσι γενέσθαι λίμνης τῆς Τριτωνίδος. καί οἱ ἀπορέοντι τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν λόγος ἐστὶ φανῆναι Τρίτωνα καὶ κελεύειν τὸν Ἰήσονα ἑωυτῷ δοῦναι τὸν τρίποδα, φάμενόν σφι καὶ τὸν πόρον δέξειν καὶ ἀπήμονας ἀποστελέειν. πειθομένου δὲ τοῦ Ἰήσονος, οὕτω δὴ τόν τε διέκπλοον τῶν βραχέων δεικνύναι τὸν Τρίτωνά σφι καὶ τὸν τρίποδα θεῖναι ἐν τῷ ἑωυτοῦ ἱρῷ, ἐπιθεσπίσαντά τε τῷ τρίποδι καὶ τοῖσι σὺν Ἰήσονι σημήναντα τὸν πάντα λόγον, ὡς ἐπεὰν τὸν τρίποδα κομίσηται τῶν ἐκγόνων τις τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ συμπλεόντων, τότε ἑκατὸν πόλιας οἰκῆσαι περὶ τὴν Τριτωνίδα λίμνην Ἑλληνίδας πᾶσαν εἶναι ἀνάγκην. ταῦτα ἀκούσαντας τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους τῶν Λιβύων κρύψαι τὸν τρίποδα.

180 Τούτων δὲ ἔχονται τῶν Μαχλύων Αὐσέες· οὗτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ Μάχλυες πέριξ τὴν Τριτωνίδα λίμνην οἰκέουσι, τὸ μέσον δέ σφι οὐρίζει ὁ Τρίτων. καὶ οἱ μὲν Μάχλυες τὰ ὀπίσω κομῶσι τῆς κεφαλῆς, οἱ δὲ Αὐσέες τὰ ἔμπροσθε. ὁρτῇ δὲ ἐνιαυσίῃ

---

paid on the outward voyage, or rather on a voyage to Delphi. (2) In Pindar Triton gives the Argonaut Euphemos (ancestor of Battos) a clod of Libyan earth, while in Hdt.'s version Triton receives from Jason a tripod, and promptly puts it to its Delphic use, divines on it, and foretells to Jason and his crew the whole story, *i.e.* truth (τὸν πάντα λόγον). Had the exaggerated hopes of Hellenic colonisation in Libya ever been more nearly realised doubtless the old tripod of Jason's would have been forthcoming. An unfulfilled prophecy is specially precious to the student as showing that all oracles are not to be dismissed as *vaticinia post eventum*. Where Hdt. got this story it is not easy to say: Rawlinson indeed remarks, "Hdt. is here only reporting the story as it was told by some poet": but the bourne of Jason's voyage suggests a Delphic source. In Diodor. (4. 56) Triton is euhemerised into a king of the country. The symbolical clod of earth reappears in one of the foundation legends of Thera: according to which Euphemos, after receiving the clod from Triton, threw it into the sea where it became Kalliste (Thera). Apollon. Rh. *Argonaut.* 4. 1549 ff., 1753 ff.

180. 1. **Αὐσέες.** The Ausees are also untraceable. Rawlinson suggests a possible identity with the Ausurians of Synesius: Saint-Martin finds them again in the *Johannis* of Corippus 2. 58 Autileten patriis non mollior Ausis (patris non mollior ausis, Bekker).

4. **ὁρτῇ δὲ ἐνιαυσίῃ.** There follows a description of the annual festival with which Athene Tritonis is worshipped by the Ausean maidens, consisting of (1) a procession, (2) a worry between two companies. The words τῷ αὐθιγενέι θεῷ λέγουσα τ. π. ἀ. stand here as if to confute K. O. Müller's idea that we have in the passage merely a Libyan reproduction of the worship of the "Boeotian" Athene, introduced into Libya by the Minyan colonists. Is it not more probable that the deity and ritual were of native and local origin, and that, if the details are correctly given by Hdt., there was some religious syncretism after contact with the Greeks? There was, perhaps, in Hdt.'s time a theory current that the Libyan cult was of Hellenic origin, supported no

Ἀθηναίης αἱ παρθένοι αὐτῶν δίχα διαστᾶσαι μάχονται πρὸς ἀλλήλας λίθοισί τε καὶ ξύλοισι, τῷ αὐθιγενέι θεῷ λέγουσαι τὰ πάτρια ἀποτελέειν, τὴν Ἀθηναίην καλέομεν. τὰς δὲ ἀποθνησκούσας τῶν παρθένων ἐκ τῶν τρωμάτων ψευδοπαρθένους καλέουσι. πρὶν δὲ ἀνεῖναι αὐτὰς μάχεσθαι, τάδε ποιεῦσι κοινῇ· παρθένον τὴν καλλιστεύουσαν ἑκάστοτε κοσμήσαντες κυνέῃ τε Κορινθίῃ καὶ πανοπλίῃ Ἑλληνικῇ καὶ ἐπ' ἅρμα ἀναβιβάσαντες περιάγουσι τὴν λίμνην κύκλῳ. ὁτέοισι δὲ τὸ πάλαι ἐκόσμεον τὰς παρθένους πρὶν ἤ σφι Ἕλληνας παροικισθῆναι, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, δοκέω δ' ὦν Αἰγυπτίοισι ὅπλοισι κοσμέεσθαι αὐτάς· ἀπὸ γὰρ Αἰγύπτου καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα καὶ τὸ κράνος φημὶ ἀπῖχθαι ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. τὴν δὲ Ἀθηναίην φασὶ Ποσειδέωνος εἶναι θυγατέρα καὶ τῆς Τριτωνίδος λίμνης, καί μιν μεμφθεῖσάν τι τῷ πατρὶ δοῦναι ἑωυτὴν τῷ Διί, τὸν δὲ Δία ἑωυτοῦ μιν ποιήσασθαι θυγατέρα. ταῦτα μὲν λέγουσι, μῖξιν δὲ ἐπίκοινον τῶν γυναικῶν ποιέονται, οὔτε συνοικέοντες κτηνηδόν τε μισγόμενοι. ἐπεὰν δὲ γυναικὶ τὸ παιδίον ἁδρὸν

---

doubt by the evidence of the 'Corinthian helm' and 'Hellenic panoply,' with which the belle, chosen to personate the goddess (cp. story of Phya, 1. 60), was equipped. This theory Hdt. apparently sets himself to combat. If the cult was native and primitive, the question arose, what arms were employed before the advent of the Hellenes? To solve this difficulty Hdt. expressly offers a conjecture of his own: the damsel was equipped in Egyptian armour. For this belief he gives a very unfortunate reason, viz. his own theory that the Greek ἀσπίς and κράνος were introduced from Egypt. The evidence of the monuments is against this theory (Rawlinson and Stein *ad l.*), and it is inconsistent with the story of the Bronzemen which Hdt. himself tells 2. 152. It may be observed that Hdt. uses the two terms κυνέη (galea) and κράνος (cassis) as equivalent: had he used them with a consciousness of their originally distinct meanings, he might have hit upon a theory that would have squared with the theory c. 189 *infra* that the snakes of the aigis were originally *leathern* thongs. Why Hdt. supposes that the Libyan goddess had Egyptian armour before she had Grecian is not clear: not, surely, by such a syllogism: Greek armour originally came from Egypt, this is Greek armour, *ergo*, it was originally Egyptian! More probably he supposes that Egyptian influences once extended as far as Lake Tritonis; for he nowhere betrays any knowledge of the Libyan regime in Egypt. (Cp. Appendix XII.) Anyway, if a native war-goddess was worshipped by the Ausees she was no doubt armed with native weapons. But on the shore of the lesser Syrtis we are already within the limits of the Carthaginian influence, and it may be conjectured that in this daughter of Poseidon and Tritonis we have a Liby-Phoenician deity not to be distinguished from Astarte. (This appears to be Baehr's view too: cp. his German translation, note *ad l.*:) or at least that there was a syncretism between a Punic and Libyan cult, before the Greek influence, if ever, was added. If a Corinthian helmet was used on the lesser Syrtis the probability is that it was imported *via* Syracuse.

12. **κύκλῳ.** How the procession could go round a lake, which, according to his own showing, is an arm of the sea and has a large river flowing into it, Hdt. omits to explain. The account of the ritual may have come from one source, and the geography from another.

19. **μῖξιν δέ.** On the supposed customs cp. note c. 172 *supra*. Aristotle may have had this passage in mind when he criticised Plato's Communism, *Pol.* 2. 3, 9, 1262 a.

γένηται, συμφοιτῶσι ἐς τὠυτὸ οἱ ἄνδρες τρίτου μηνός, καὶ τῷ ἂν οἴκῃ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὸ παιδίον, τούτου παῖς νομίζεται.

181 Οὗτοι μὲν οἱ παραθαλάσσιοι τῶν νομάδων Λιβύων εἰρέαται, ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων ἐς μεσόγαιαν ἡ θηριώδης ἐστὶ Λιβύη, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς θηριώδεος ὀφρύη ψάμμης κατήκει παρατείνουσα ἀπὸ Θηβέων τῶν Αἰγυπτιέων ἐπ' Ἡρακλέας στήλας. ἐν δὲ τῇ ὀφρύῃ ταύτῃ μάλιστα

---

181. 2. **ἡ θηριώδης Λιβύη.** The shy and peaceable Garamantes have been described as dwelling in the θηριώδης Λιβύη, c. 174 *supra*. There are according to Hdt. (or the authorities followed by him) three or rather four belts in Libya: ἡ παραθαλασσία (Λιβύη), ἡ θηριώδης, ὀφρύη ψάμμης extending all across the continent, and finally ἡ ἔρημος. The most northern or seacoast belt is divided, by the river Triton, into an eastern section inhabited by Nomads, and a western, inhabited by Husbandmen, c. 191 *infra*. In the present chapter Hdt. (having described the population of the Nomad section of the northern belt, cc. 168-180, and of the second belt so far as inhabited c. 174) proceeds to describe the chain of Oases in the sandy ridge, from Thebes to the Pillars of Herakles: oddly enough he does not use the term Oasis, except once as a proper name, 3. 26. Almost every feature in this geographical scheme is an exaggeration or a defect. Rawlinson, indeed, defends Hdt. from Niebuhr's criticism, and asserts that there are in fact three (*sic*) tracts which stretch across the continent from Egypt to the Atlantic ocean, first the coast tract, comparatively fertile; next, the hill-region (*sic*), "which especially in its more western (*sic*) parts is greatly infested with wild beasts"; thirdly, the Great Sahara. But Rawl. admits that these distinctions are to a great extent fanciful, and the most to be said for Hdt. is that his artificial scheme had some relation to natural facts. For a description of the Libyan desert, or eastern portion, see Keith Johnston's *Africa* (Stanford) pp. 104-107, from which it will be seen that the apologetics of Heeren and Rawlinson go too far. As a matter of fact the zone-theory suits western Libya (esp. Algeria) better than the region from Egypt to Carthage: and might have been thence derived. Rawlinson appears also to go too far (with Heeren) in extolling the virtues of Hdt.'s description of the caravan route, and in defending Hdt. on the ground that he only says the stations are separated by "about" (μάλιστα) ten days' journey each from the next. Rawlinson overlooks the fact that in the details Hdt. separates the stations by exactly ten days. Cp. *infra*.

3. **ἀπὸ Θηβέων τῶν Αἰγυπτιέων ἐπ' Ἡρακλέας στήλας.** The *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* here mentioned are both puzzling. Not Thebes but Memphis should be the point of departure (cp. note below), and the Pillars of Herakles suggest a voyage rather than a desert journey. The passage looks as though it were based on the information gathered by Hanno: who touched the desert a day's voyage short of Kerne, *Periplus* 8 (*Geogr. Min.* i. p. 6), cp. c. 195 *infra*. Did Hdt. conceive the line here indicated as a diagonal? Or had he no very clear conception in the matter at all, and did he use the 'Pillars' simply to suggest the far west? The phraseology in c. 185 *infra* seems to show that by the Pillars he means the meridian of the Pillars. But even so, the chain of Oases is too far extended, and this description takes no account of the mountains of Algeria and Marocco. This ὀφρύη ψάμμης must be a combination, or inference, based upon several particulars, starting from the sandy desert bordering on Egypt, perhaps connected with the 'hill-region,' mentioned by Rawlinson as corresponding to Hdt.'s θηριώδης, but all exaggerated and systematised, like other features in Hdt.'s Libya. As a matter of fact the oases of Siweh and Aujila are not on a sandbank but each in a hollow. Cp. K. Johnston's *Africa*, p. 106.

4. **μάλιστα.** Rawlinson emphasises this word, as though Hdt. did not intend to make the intervals exactly ten days, overlooking the fact that the historian separates the particular places named *infra* by *exactly* ten days' journey each from the next. Should not the μάλιστα here then be taken with the preceding words ἐν δὲ τῇ ὀφρύῃ ταύτῃ?

διὰ δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ ἁλός ἐστι τρύφεα κατὰ χόνδρους μεγάλους ἐν κολωνοῖσι, καὶ ἐν κορυφῇσι ἑκάστου τοῦ κολωνοῦ ἀνακοντίζει ἐκ μέσου τοῦ ἁλὸς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν καὶ γλυκύ, περὶ δὲ αὐτὸν ἄνθρωποι οἰκέουσι ἔσχατοι πρὸς τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς θηριώδεος, πρῶτοι μὲν ἀπὸ Θηβέων διὰ δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ Ἀμμώνιοι, ἔχοντες τὸ ἱρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θηβαιέος Διός· καὶ γὰρ [τὸ] ἐν Θήβῃσι, ὡς καὶ πρότερον εἴρηταί μοι, κριοπρόσωπον τοῦ Διὸς τὤγαλμά ἐστι. τυγχάνει δὲ καὶ ἄλλο σφι ὕδωρ κρηναῖον ἐόν, τὸ τὸν μὲν ὄρθρον γίνεται χλιαρόν, ἀγορῆς δὲ πληθυούσης ψυχρότερον, μεσαμβρίη τέ ἐστι καὶ τὸ κάρτα γίνεται ψυχρόν· τηνικαῦτα δὲ ἄρδουσι τοὺς κήπους· ἀποκλινομένης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρης ὑπίεται τοῦ ψυχροῦ, ἐς οὗ δύεταί τε ὁ ἥλιος καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ γίνεται χλιαρόν· ἐπὶ δὲ μᾶλλον ἰὸν ἐς τὸ θερμὸν ἐς μέσας νύκτας πελάζει, τηνικαῦτα δὲ ζέει ἀμβολάδην· παρέρχονταί τε μέσαι νύκτες καὶ ψύχεται μέχρι ἐς ἠῶ. ἐπίκλησιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ κρήνη καλέεται ἡλίου.

'On this sandbank roughly speaking, at intervals of ten days' journey.'

5. **ἁλός.** Salt is found in patches, sometimes in extended tracts, in North Africa, and springs occasionally rise in their midst, but as Rawlinson admits "the general character of these salt-tracts is rather of plains than of hills." We have in fact here apparently again a confusion and an exaggeration, the oases are identified with salt patches, and the salt patches are endowed with springs, and the springs are elevated on conspicuous hills at intervals of ten days' journey. R. Neumann, who remarks that Hdt. can never have set eyes on an oasis, suggests that Hdt. placed the springs on hill-tops for two reasons: (1) that situation is common in Greece, (2) the sand had to be kept out of the springs (*Nordafrica*, p. 86 f.).

8. **πρῶτοι μὲν ἀπὸ Θηβέων διὰ δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ Ἀμμώνιοι.** The Ammonium is identified with the oasis of Siweh. Siweh is at least twenty days' journey from Thebes. The ordinary caravan route is from Memphis, which is in the same latitude as Siweh, and twelve days' journey. Hdt.'s description is thus apparently in double error. Thebes was not the natural point of departure, and was at least twice as far off as he states. Saint-Martin has a far-fetched explanation of Hdt.'s error. He observes that the great oasis is seven days from Thebes, and that three days beyond the great oasis is the oasis of Dakhél. He argues that there was *a* sanctuary of Ammon at Dakhél. He supposes that it was against Dakhél, and not against Siweh that Kambyses directed an expedition from *Thebes*, 3. 26. He infers that Hdt. has confused the Ammonium of Siweh with the Ammonium of Dakhél, which is twenty days' journey distant. He thus recovers twenty days for the Itinerary of Hdt. and leaves Thebes as the starting point. But it is easier to believe that Hdt. was in error in making Thebes the point of departure. He might more naturally have done so as the god Ammon was from Thebes. R. Neumann (*op. c.* p. 99) explains the error in Hdt. by the hypothesis that he had enquired of the *priests* in Thebes (*sic*) the distance of the oasis of Ammon (meaning Siweh), and that they gave him the distance to the temple of Ammon at Dachel (*sic*).

10. **ὡς καὶ πρότερον**, 2. 42. **τὸ** *secl.* Stein.

14. **τε καί.** For the co-ordination, cp. 199 *infra*.

19. **ἡ κρήνη κ. ἡλίου.** "The supposed variation in the temperature of the water is an illusion of the senses produced by the changes of the atmospheric temperature" (Saint-Martin). This, however, will hardly account for the ζέει ἀμβολάδην, which Wilkinson *apud* Rawl. explains as a mistaken inference from the numerous bubbles which rise in these sulphureous ponds. The bubbles would presumably rise at all times: it seems unlikely that the

182 Μετὰ δὲ Ἀμμωνίους διὰ τῆς ὀφρύης τῆς ψάμμου δι᾽ ἀλλέων δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ κολωνός τε ἁλός ἐστι ὅμοιος τῷ Ἀμμωνίῳ καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ἄνθρωποι περὶ αὐτὸν οἰκέουσι· τῷ δὲ χώρῳ τούτῳ οὔνομα Αὔγιλά ἐστι. ἐς τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον οἱ Νασαμῶνες ὀπωριεῦντες
183 τοὺς φοίνικας φοιτῶσι. ἀπὸ δὲ Αὐγίλων διὰ δέκα ἡμερέων ἀλλέων ὁδοῦ ἕτερος ἁλὸς κολωνὸς καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ φοίνικες καρποφόροι πολλοί, κατά περ καὶ ἐν τοῖσι ἑτέροισι· καὶ ἄνθρωποι οἰκέουσι ἐν αὐτῷ τοῖσι οὔνομα Γαράμαντές ἐστι, ἔθνος μέγα ἰσχυρῶς, οἳ ἐπὶ τὸν ἅλα γῆν ἐπιφορέοντες οὕτω σπείρουσι. συντομώτατον δ᾽ ἐστὶ ἐς τοὺς Λωτοφάγους, ἐκ τῶν τριήκοντα ἡμερέων ἐς αὐτοὺς ὁδός ἐστι· ἐν τοῖσι καὶ οἱ ὀπισθονόμοι βόες γίνονται· ὀπισθονόμοι δὲ διὰ τόδε εἰσί. τὰ κέρεα ἔχουσι κεκυφότα ἐς τὸ ἔμπροσθε· διὰ τοῦτο ὀπίσω ἀναχωρέοντες νέμονται· ἐς γὰρ τὸ ἔμπροσθε οὐκ οἷοί τέ

---

gardens were watered at the hottest moment of the day.

In marking the subdivisions of the day (or night) Herodotus does not avail himself for narrative purposes of the twelve subdivisions which, he tells us, 2. 109, the Greeks borrowed from the Babylonians (*ὥρη*, 8. 14, 9. 52, points of time). He employs a more poetical terminology (sometimes even thrillingly graphic, *e.g.* *περὶ λύχνων ἀφὰς* 7. 215) taken over from the daily life of the people. There are seven divisions of the day and night (4+3) here employed. With *τὸν ὄρθρον* cp. *ἅμα δὲ ὄρθρῳ* 7. 188, *τὸ ὄρθριον* 2. 173 (*ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος* 7. 223, *ἐξ ἠοῦς* 7. 167); with *ἀγορῆς πληθυούσης* cp. *πληθούσης* (*v.l.* *πληθώρης*) *ἀγορῆς* 2. 173, *ἀγορῆς πληθώρην* 7. 223 (*πρωῒ τῆς ἡμέρης* 9. 101); with *ἀποκλινομένης τῆς ἡμέρης* cp. *ἀποκλιναμένης τῆς μεσαμβρίης* 3. 104 (*δείλη* 9. 101, *δείλη πρωΐη* 8. 6, *ὀψίη* 8. 9, 167); with *δύεται ὁ ἥλιος* cp. *δύντος ἡλίου* 7. 149, *μεσαμβρίη* 3. 104, c. 113 *supra*, *ἠώς* 7. 217.

182. 4. **Αὔγιλα**, c. 172 *supra*. Augila or Aujila is a comparatively important spot, marked on the modern maps, and well described by Hamilton, *Wanderings*, c. xiv. Hamilton describes Jalo, 28 miles or eight hours E.S.E. from Aujila, as by far the most important in this group of oases. The distance between Siweh and Aujila is stated by K. Johnston as twelve days' journey; Hornemann accomplished it in nine days, at high pressure: ten days is given by Rawlinson, Saint-Martin and others as the usual local computation.

οἱ Νασαμῶνες, cc. 172 *supra*, 190 *infra*.

183. 4. **Γαράμαντες.** On the tribe, see below. The station described in this chapter is generally identified with the modern district Fezzan (see Rawlinson), but the ten days' journey is again a crux, or rather a manifest error. "It takes sixteen days at the least to cross the desert between Augila, which is at the edge of the Oasis, and *Temissa*, the first village in Fezzan" (Rawlinson). The supposition that Hdt. has simply omitted a station, and that the distance from Augila to the headquarters of the Garamantes should be estimated at twenty days, two stages of ten days each, seems to ascribe too high a value to the decimal computation upon which Hdt.'s itinerary is based.

6. **Λωτοφάγους**, c. 177 *supra*.

ὁδός. A caravan route, in all probability, crossing Fezzan from the interior, and terminating at the modern Tripoli. (Cp. K. Johnston's *Africa*, pp. 70, 99, and Rawlinson, note *ad l.*) It is apparently thirty days' journey from Murzuk, the capital of Fezzan, to the coast; but Murzuk is far to the south of Augila, and a caravan coming from Augila westwards would presumably strike this route at Sokna, about halfway between Murzuk and Tripoli.

7. **οἱ ὀπισθονόμοι βόες.** Baehr collects the passages in ancient writers which support this traveller's tale: Heeren suggested that the peculiarity was artificially produced by the hinds: Rawlinson finds it difficult to assign a motive for a practice so inconvenient.

εἰσι προεμβαλλόντων ἐς τὴν γῆν τῶν κερέων. ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲν διαφέρουσι τῶν ἄλλων βοῶν ὅτι μὴ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ δέρμα ἐς παχύτητά τε καὶ τρῖψιν. οἱ Γαράμαντες δὴ οὗτοι τοὺς τρωγλοδύτας Αἰθίοπας θηρεύουσι τοῖσι τεθρίπποισι· οἱ γὰρ τρωγλοδύται Αἰθίοπες πόδας τάχιστοι ἀνθρώπων πάντων εἰσὶ τῶν ἡμεῖς πέρι λόγους ἀποφερομένους ἀκούομεν. σιτέονται δὲ οἱ τρωγλοδύται ὄφις καὶ σαύρους καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἑρπετῶν· γλῶσσαν δὲ οὐδεμιῇ ἄλλῃ παρομοίην νενομίκασι, ἀλλὰ τετρίγασι κατά περ αἱ νυκτερίδες.

Ἀπὸ δὲ Γαραμάντων δι' ἀλλέων δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ ἄλλος 184
ἁλός τε κολωνὸς καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ἄνθρωποι περὶ αὐτὸν οἰκέουσι τοῖσι οὔνομά ἐστι Ἀτάραντες, οἳ ἀνώνυμοί εἰσι μοῦνοι ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· ἀλέσι μὲν γάρ σφί ἐστι Ἀτάραντες οὔνομα, ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν οὔνομα οὐδὲν κέεται. οὗτοι τῷ ἡλίῳ ὑπερβάλλοντι

---

12. **οἱ Γαράμαντες δὴ οὗτοι** resuming from Γαράμαντες *supra ad init. cap.* need not be referred back to c. 174. It appears in fact from a comparison of the two passages that the Garamantes of c. 174 are the Troglodyte Aethiopians of c. 183. The Garamantes of the passage before us may be identified with the population of Fezzan, the ancient capital of which was Garama (Djerma). The 'Aethiopians' here referred to are to be no less certainly found in the Tibbus, still the victims of man-hunting raids, the slave-trade being the principal source of wealth in Fezzan. (K. Johnston, *Africa*, p. 100, Saint-Martin, *op. c.* p. 50.) The four-horsed chariots are out of fashion. 'Troglodytes' or cave-dwellers here may suggest the Tibbus Reshade, 'Tibbus of the Rocks' (Tiboû Réchadèh, Saint-Martin), who however have been described by Nachtigal as rapacious, treacherous, and cruel, a character due perhaps to six centuries of suffering in the slave raids. The Tibbus are still described as fleet of foot, and their language compared to the whistling of birds: *cp.* references in Rawlinson and Saint-Martin.

184. 3. **Ἀτάραντες** is an emendation by Salmasius from Rhianus, *apud* Steph. Byz., the MSS. all reading Ἄτλαντες. The name in any case looks suspiciously like a duplicate of the Ἄτλαντες *infra* (cp. Γαράμαντες, Γαμφάσαντες). It has even been suggested that the name Atlas (Atlantes, Atarantes) is a softened form of *Adrâr*, mountain, the chain of mountains still called by the Berbers *Idraren*, *Adareren*, in the plural. (Saint-Martin, p. 60.)

ἀνώνυμοι. Other ancient authorities are quoted by Baehr, but a total absence of proper names is unparalleled and inconceivable. Rawlinson therefore concludes that Hdt. "probably misunderstood his informant." Stein quotes *Od.* 6. 552 *οὐ μὲν γάρ τις πάμπαν ἀνώνυμός ἐστ' ἀνθρώπων.* May it not be that the report rests on a misconception of a savage taboo, or custom of silence, in regard to proper names (cp. 1. 146 custom of the Karian women *μή κοτε ὁμοσιτῆσαι τοῖσι ἀνδράσι μηδὲ οὐνόματι βῶσαι τὸν ἑωυτῆς ἄνδρα*): for instances and explanation of which, see Tylor, *Early History of Mankind*, pp. 141 ff.

5. **ὑπερβάλλοντι.** Some of the commentators halt between two opinions here, viz. between II. and III. in L. & S.[7] *sub voc.* Stein's *nimis urenti* seems best: in which case the passage should be placed in L. & S. under II. Rawlinson's "when the sun rises high in the heaven" is ambiguous: does it mean midday, or midsummer, or midsummer-midday? Strabo 822 describes an Aethiopian tribe, *πρὸς τῇ διακεκαυμένῃ*, as cursing the rising sun. "When one really feels the high temperature is when down with fever; or when fever, unknown to one, is coming on. Then, indeed, the heat becomes maddening and insupportable; nor has the victim words to express his feelings towards

καταρῶνται καὶ πρὸς τούτοισι πάντα τὰ αἰσχρὰ λοιδορέονται, ὅτι σφέας καίων ἐπιτρίβει, αὐτούς τε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τὴν χώρην αὐτῶν. μετὰ δὲ δι' ἀλλέων δέκα ἡμερέων ἄλλος κολωνὸς ἁλὸς καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ἄνθρωποι περὶ αὐτὸν οἰκέουσι. ἔχεται δὲ τοῦ ἁλὸς τούτου ὄρος τῷ οὔνομά ἐστι Ἄτλας, ἔστι δὲ στεινὸν καὶ κυκλοτερὲς πάντῃ, ὑψηλὸν δὲ οὕτω δή τι λέγεται ὡς τὰς κορυφὰς αὐτοῦ οὐκ οἷά τε εἶναι ἰδέσθαι· οὐδέκοτε γὰρ αὐτὰς ἀπολείπειν νέφεα οὔτε θέρεος οὔτε χειμῶνος. τοῦτο τὸν κίονα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσι οἱ ἐπιχώριοι εἶναι. ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ ὄρεος οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι ἐπώνυμοι ἐγένοντο· καλέονται γὰρ δὴ Ἄτλαντες. λέγονται δὲ οὔτε ἔμψυχον οὐδὲν σιτέεσθαι οὔτε ἐνύπνια ὁρᾶν.

185 Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἀτλάντων τούτων ἔχω τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν ἐν τῇ ὀφρύῃ κατοικημένων καταλέξαι, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τούτων οὐκέτι.

---

the glittering ball, whose daily march across the burnished and veilless zenith brings him untold agony." Drummond, *Tropical Africa*, p. 109.

10. **Ἄτλας.** Hdt.'s last oasis or station lands us at the foot of Mount Atlas, somewhere south of Carthage, or of Tunis. This description of Mount Atlas in no respect corresponds to the local facts. If there be any more than fancy in it the description might have arisen from some distorted account of the Peak of Teneriffe, combined with a knowledge of mountainous ground in the west of the mainland. The region of the Atlas embraces the whole district between the Atlantic and the Syrtis minor, comprising roughly speaking Marocco, Algeria, and Tunis, and bounded on the south by the Sahara. The Atlas proper, or Great Atlas, is a lofty mountain range wholly within Marocco: there are however two lesser mountain ranges in Algeria, parallel to the coast, to which French geographers give the names of lesser and middle Atlas. The highest points attain an elevation of about 6000 feet. A third chain to the south is called by some French geographers the Great Atlas: the term Sahara Border range is to be preferred. (K. Johnston's *Africa*, c. ii.) From a comparison of these facts with Hdt.'s statements it is plain that he is quite ignorant of the true orography of the country, and in particular moves Mount Atlas 15-20° long. to the east, and converts it into a single peak.

11. **λέγεται . . λέγουσι οἱ ἐπιχώριοι . . λέγονται.** Hdt. makes no pretence to have seen the column of Heaven, nor should it be inferred that he claims to have conversed with the natives, cp. Introduction, p. lxxvii. The metaphor is due to Greek poetry (Aischyl. *Pr. Vinct.* 357) and not to local fancy, which could not have applied such an hyperbole to the Algerian ranges: but it need not be original in Aischylos, and it has a Semitic ring about it (cp. Job 26. 11, "The pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at his reproof." See also Exodus 13. 21). We seem in this chapter to come more clearly within range of western sources: it is not likely that traders and men of science in Magna Graecia and Sicily were without their ideas on western Libya, filtered through Liby-Phoenician sources perhaps. Cp. c. 181 *supra*, and Introduction, pp. xcvii. ff.

16. **ἐνύπνια ὁρᾶν.** The Atlantes are vegetarians and never dream: cause and effect? That mountaineers should eat no flesh is obviously improbable. Clouds, indeed, rest upon Atlas and the Atlantes, and if not dreamers themselves, they still are the cause of dreams in others—of which the last specimen is Knötel's *Atlantis und das Volk der Atlanten*, Leipzig, 1893, one of those works in which much learning and little judgment have combined to produce wondrous visions.

185. 2. **τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τούτων.** The oasis (*κολωνὸς ἁλὸς καὶ ὕδωρ*) of the Atlantes carries us no farther than the eastern frontiers of modern Algeria, if so far: it would be rash to identify Hdt.'s last

διήκει δ' ὦν ἡ ὀφρύη μέχρι Ἡρακλέων στηλέων καὶ τὸ ἔξω τουτέων. ἔστι δὲ ἁλός τε μέταλλον ἐν αὐτῇ διὰ δέκα ἡμερέων ὁδοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωποι οἰκέοντες. τὰ δὲ οἰκία τούτοισι πᾶσι ἐκ τῶν ἁλίνων χόνδρων οἰκοδομέαται. ταῦτα γὰρ ἤδη τῆς Λιβύης ἄνομβρά ἐστι· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἠδυνέατο μένειν οἱ τοῖχοι ἐόντες ἅλινοι, εἰ ὗε. ὁ δὲ ἃλς αὐτόθι καὶ λευκὸς καὶ πορφύρεος τὸ εἶδος ὀρύσσεται. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς

---

station with Ghadames, or with any of the oases of the Algerian Sahara (on these, see K. Johnston's *Africa*, pp. 89-95).

3. **διήκει δ' ὦν.** The ὀφρύη is practically a figment, but the desert south of Algeria and Marocco is only bounded on the west by the ocean, and is crossed north and south, east and west, by caravan routes (see K. Johnston's *Africa*, c. viii.), with stations at very irregular intervals.

ἔξω τουτέων. A legitimate inference from this phrase is that Hdt. conceives of Libya as projecting beyond the meridian of the straits. The extension of the desert to the ocean was known to Hanno. Cp. c. 181 *supra*.

4. **ἔστι . . οἰκέοντες.** Do these words introduce a fresh oasis-station, or simply—as Rawlinson takes it—resume the description of the whole line of stations? He translates: "throughout the whole distance, at the end of every ten days' journey, there is a salt-mine, with people dwelling round it." It is not indeed quite clear whether "the whole distance" means "the whole remaining distance," or the whole distance from Thebes to the Pillars of Herakles (c. 181 *supra*): apparently the latter. In this case Rawlinson identifies μέταλλον ἁλὸς here with κολωνὸς ἁλὸς in cc. 181, 182 *supra*: and to make his translation good we should require μέταλλα not μέταλλον. Oddly enough in his note, vol. iii. p. 160, he writes μέταλλα. The τούτοισι πᾶσι and the τῶν ἁλ. χόνδρων (the latter recalling c. 181, *supra*) seem to support, or to have suggested, R.'s view. Stein, Blakesley and Baehr all understand the words here to refer to another (sixth) station beyond the Atlantes, and so grammatically the words must be taken; but the remark falls short of what we might expect. If the ὀφρύη extends beyond Mount Atlas, and beyond the Pillars, would Hdt. be content with one single station in all that remaining distance? It looks as though what he was for saying, when his heart failed him, was that throughout the remainder of the ὀφρύη the same rule held good as obtained as far as Atlas, viz. that at regular intervals of ten days' journey, as far as ever the sand-ridge went, were oases; or salt and fresh-water stations: he has only courage for one more station explicitly. The result is some obscurity and clumsiness: a falling between two stools. Cp. the still more conspicuous instance, 6. 57 *infra*.

ἐν αὐτῇ. In the ὀφρύη, to wit, in that part of it beyond Atlas.

5. **τούτοισι πᾶσι.** Obscure: does it refer to the inhabitants of the single station west of Atlas, just mentioned: in which case πᾶσι seems jejune and superfluous: or to all the inhabitants of all the salt-stations, which seems suggested by τῶν ἁλ. χ. repeated from c. 181? As matter of fact the houses built of salt-blocks are genuine, and have been seen by modern travellers in the Libyan desert and in Fezzan (see Rawlinson) though not apparently in the western Sahara.

6. **ἤδη.** Even so far north. Cp. c. 191 *infra*. ταῦτα may be taken to apply to the whole parallel of the ὀφρύη. The remark looks suspiciously like an inference from the argument introduced by the γὰρ following. Cp. c. 189 *infra*.

7. **ὁ δὲ ἃλς.** Three different coloured salts are found, reddish, white, bluish: see authorities quoted by Rawlinson.

8. **ὑπὲρ κτλ.** This is an exaggerated account of the Sahara. Cp. K. Johnston, *Africa*, cc. vii. viii., though Tristram, *The Great Sahara*, Appendix I. (On the physical geography of the Sahara), using Sahara in a restricted sense for the sandy pasture land, distinguishes from it the Desert to the south "arid, salt, affording no sustinence to cattle or sheep, . . . excepting in its rare oases, equally inhospitable to man." The camel however snatches a scanty subsistence, and there are the rare oases.

ὀφρύης τὸ πρὸς νότου καὶ ἐς μεσόγαιαν τῆς Λιβύης ἔρημος καὶ ἄνυδρος καὶ ἄθηρος καὶ ἄνομβρος καὶ ἄξυλός ἐστι ἡ χώρη, καὶ ἰκμάδος ἐστὶ ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδέν.

186 Οὕτω μὲν μέχρι τῆς Τριτωνίδος λίμνης ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου νομάδες
εἰσὶ κρεοφάγοι τε καὶ γαλακτοπόται Λίβυες, καὶ θηλέων τε βοῶν
οὔτι γευόμενοι, διότι περ οὐδὲ Αἰγύπτιοι, καὶ ὗς οὐ τρέφοντες.
βοῶν μέν νυν θηλέων οὐδ' αἱ Κυρηναίων γυναῖκες δικαιεῦσι
πατέεσθαι διὰ τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Ἶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νηστηίας αὐτῇ καὶ
ὁρτὰς ἐπιτελέουσι· αἱ δὲ τῶν Βαρκαίων γυναῖκες οὐδὲ ὑῶν πρὸς
187 τῇσι βουσὶ γεύονται. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἔχει. τὸ δὲ πρὸς
ἑσπέρης τῆς Τριτωνίδος λίμνης οὐκέτι νομάδες εἰσὶ Λίβυες οὐδὲ
νόμοισι τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι χρεώμενοι, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὰ παιδία ποιεῦντες
οἷόν τι καὶ οἱ νομάδες ἐώθασι ποιέειν. οἱ γὰρ δὴ τῶν Λιβύων

---

186. 1. **οὕτω μέν.** There follows, rather abruptly, an account of the culture of the Nomad Libyans between Egypt and Lake Tritonis (cc. 186-190): geographically and ethnographically the scene shifts back to where we were in c. 180: or perhaps to the close of c. 183. As already observed cc. 184 f. seem to belong to a somewhat different stratum, and to carry us, though vaguely, far beyond the 'Lake Tritonis.' Moreover *κρεοφάγοι* is inapplicable to the *Ἄτλαντες* of c. 184, and bears out the suspicion that cc. 184 f., if not the whole passage on the Oases (cc. 181-185), are an addition, or contagmination. The description following is presumably intended to apply generally to the tribes previously enumerated (omitting c. 184): but it is inapplicable to the Lotophagi described c. 177. Flesh and milk are the proper food of 'Nomads,' so Hippokr. *de aer. et locc.* § 94, *αὐτοὶ δ' ἐσθίουσι κρέα ἑφθὰ καὶ πίνουσι γάλα ἵππων* (*apud* Baehr).

3. **διότι.** The Egyptians abstained for a theological reason, 2. 41. As milk was so important to the Libyans they may have had a good economical reason. In Kyrene and Barka, however, the cult of Isis may have been established, as well as among the Libyan tribes. The women in the Greek colonies would be native Libyans to some extent. Barka was more Libyan than Kyrene (cp. c. 160 *supra*) and the women of Barka were more puritan than those of Kyrene. On pigs, see 2. 47: and c. 63 *supra*. The flesh of swine was extremely popular with Hellenes: cp. *Od.* ξ (14) 13-20, *et al.*

187. 1. **τὸ δὲ κτλ.** R. Neumann (*op. c.* p. 10) suggests that Hdt. borrows the distinction between E. and W. Libya from Hekataios. Cp. *Frag.* 305. This may be so, but Hdt.'s visits to Egypt and Italy if not to Kyrene itself would at least have confirmed the borrowed idea. The first sentence of this chapter prepares us for further contrasts, to be resumed c. 191, between the ethnography of eastern and that of western Libya, *i.e.* the spheres of Aegypto-Hellenic and of Carthaginian influence respectively.

2. **οὐκέτι νομάδες εἰσί** = *οὐκέτι* is virtually locative, cp. *ἤδη* previous c. It is difficult to reconcile Hdt.'s statement that west of the Lesser Syrtis there were no Nomads, with the well-grounded geography of the later and Roman authorities, which designated the western portion as Numidia *par excellence*; and though the Carthaginians are known to have promoted agriculture (cp. *Dict. Antiq.* i.[3] 55), the nomad life of shepherds and herdsmen never died out in the west (cp. Capes, *Sallust*, Introduction, pp. 38, 39). The view of Hdt. points to purely *parathalassic* sources of information, and it was just about his time that a decided effort was made by the Carthaginians to promote husbandry, cp. Mommsen, *Rom. Hist.* Bk. iii. c. i. (E.T. ii. p. 9), Meltzer, *Gesch. der Karthager*, i. 82.

3. **τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι.** Same as the Nomads.

νομάδες, εἰ μὲν πάντες, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ποιεῦσι δὲ αὐτῶν συχνοὶ τοιάδε· τῶν παιδίων τῶν σφετέρων, ἐπεὰν τετραέτεα γένηται, οἴσπῃ προβάτων καίουσι τὰς ἐν τῇσι κορυφῇσι φλέβας, μετεξέτεροι δὲ αὐτῶν τὰς ἐν τοῖσι κροτάφοισι, τοῦδε εἵνεκα ὡς μή σφεας ἐς τὸν πάντα χρόνον καταρρέον φλέγμα ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς δηλέηται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτό σφεας λέγουσι εἶναι ὑγιηροτάτους· εἰσὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθέως οἱ Λίβυες ἀνθρώπων πάντων ὑγιηρότατοι τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, εἰ μὲν διὰ τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν, ὑγιηρότατοι δ' ὦν εἰσί. ἢν δὲ καίουσι τὰ παιδία σπασμὸς ἐπιγένηται, ἐξεύρηταί σφι ἄκος· τράγου γὰρ οὖρον σπείσαντες ῥύονταί σφεα. λέγω δὲ τὰ λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Λίβυες.

Θυσίαι δὲ τοῖσι νομάσι εἰσὶ αἵδε· ἐπεὰν τοῦ ὠτὸς ἀπάρξωνται 188
τοῦ κτήνεος, ῥιπτέουσι ὑπὲρ τὸν δόμον, τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαντες ἀποστρέφουσι τὸν αὐχένα αὐτοῦ· θύουσι δὲ ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ

---

5. **εἰ μὲν πάντες . . συχνοί.** This appearance of statistical accuracy is somewhat disconcerting, especially as it might seem to imply that other general statements in Libyan ethnography are based upon an exhaustive analysis of evidences. But what evidence could Hdt. have to justify him in asserting that none of the tribes west of Tritonis practised the cautery here described, or anything like it (*οἷόν τι*)?

7. **οἴσπῃ**, *v.l. οἰσύπῃ*, but the same word, meaning apparently grease: thus *ἔρια οἰσυπηρὰ* Aristoph. *Acharn.* 1177. *οἰσυπίς* is a tuft of greasy wool: and that seems the sense here required. Cp. L. & S.[7] *sub voc.* and add *οἰσπώτη* (Aristoph. *Lys.* 575).

Cauterisation is a wide-spread remedy for various maladies, and was not peculiar to the Libyan nomads, nor confined to the object here specified. Aethiopians, Scythians, Ostiaks, Arabs, Beduins, Moors, Negroes are stated by Baehr, on various authorities, to have employed this method. Rawlinson quotes from Denham a description of the cure as "the sovereign Arab remedy for almost every disorder." But it might surprise Greeks, who favoured milder methods. Cp. 3. 130.

11. **πάντων ὑγιηρότατοι τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.** On the formula, cp. Introduction, p. civ. The healthiness of the Libyans is a fixed maxim with Hdt., cp. 2. 77. Tristram in his preface speaking of the northern Sahara (of Algiers) says: "Here an atmosphere bright, dry, and invigorating convinced me that I had found the true sanatorium for any one sufficiently convalescent to dispense with the luxuries of city life." (*Op. c.* p. v.)

13. **σπασμός.** The convulsion happens to the infant not to the operator, as we infer rather from the nature of the case than from the form of the expression. Van H. suggests *καιόντων*.

14. **λέγω κτλ.** Cp. c. 173 *supra*. His scepticism apparently extends only to the two points: (1) the reason alleged for Libyan health: (2) the *ἄκος* asserted as good for convulsions.

188. 1. **θυσίαι.** Sacrificial rites, one of Hdt.'s standing categories in ethnography. Cp. c. 60 *supra*.

2. **τὸν δόμον.** As Nomads they are scarce entitled to houses: Reiske suggested *ὦμον*. Cp. c. 190 *infra*.

3. **ἀποστρέφειν** is used of turning back the hands so as to bind them behind the back, *ἀποστρέφετε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, ὦ Σκύθαι*, Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 455. Here we may take it of turning back the neck so as to cut it. *αὐχέν' ἀποστρέψας* occurs in Theognis 858 with a different intention: *αὐχέν' ἀποστρέψας οὐδ' ἐσορᾶν ἐθέλει.*

ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ μούνοισι. If they offered sacrifices to sun and moon alone it would follow that sun and moon were the only divinities recognised by them. This is not likely, by analogy, and the words following qualify it for the Libyans on the shores of Lake Tritonis. c. 172 *supra* to some extent

μούνοισι. τούτοισι μέν νυν πάντες Λίβυες θύουσι, ἀτὰρ οἱ περὶ τὴν Τριτωνίδα λίμνην νέμοντες τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ μάλιστα, μετὰ δὲ τῷ
189 Τρίτωνι καὶ τῷ Ποσειδέωνι. τὴν δὲ ἄρα ἐσθῆτα καὶ τὰς αἰγίδας τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίης ἐκ τῶν Λιβυσσέων ἐποιήσαντο οἱ Ἕλληνες· πλὴν γὰρ ἢ ὅτι σκυτίνη ἡ ἐσθὴς τῶν Λιβυσσέων ἐστὶ καὶ οἱ θύσανοι οἱ ἐκ τῶν αἰγίδων αὐτῇσι οὐκ ὄφιές εἰσι ἀλλὰ ἱμάντινοι, τά γε ἄλλα πάντα κατὰ τὠυτὸ ἔσταλται. καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ οὔνομα κατηγορέει ὅτι ἐκ Λιβύης ἥκει ἡ στολὴ τῶν Παλλαδίων·

---

suggests a qualification for the Nasamones, though that passage does not concern θυσίαι. The Atarantes of c. 184 could hardly be described as sun-worshippers.

5. **Ἀθηναίῃ.** Athene as worshipped in Libya was hardly, perhaps, to be distinguished from the Moon-goddess. Triton is the River-god, Poseidon the Sea-god. Cp. c. 180 *supra*. The qualification here added after the strong statement (μούνοισι) just made looks like a later correction, inserted perhaps from a different (western) source.

189. 2. **τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίης.** There are two archaeological questions raised in this chapter and answered by Hdt. in favour of Libya. (1) Were the snakes on the *aigis* of Athene originally leather thongs? (2) Was the *aigis* itself derived from Libya? That the snakes of the *aigis* were originally leather thongs, forming a sort of tasselled fringe round the *aigis*, may be regarded as no less probable than that the *aigis* was itself originally a skin. (2) That the *aigis*, and indeed the whole vesture (στολή) of the statues of Athene, were derived from Libya is by no means so probable. In Homeric poems the *aigis* is not confined to Athene, but proper to Zeus and Apollo likewise. The use of skins, undressed and dressed, for clothing and defence, was not confined to the Libyans. Hdt. asserts that the *Quadriga* was introduced among the Greeks from Libya, which is at least disputable, and hazards an opinion that the ὀλολυγή was also of Libyan origin, which is even less probable. The theory of the Libyan origin of the *aigis* hardly deserves more favour, even if *aigis* originally meant 'goat-skin,' unless we are to suppose that there were no goats but in Libya. Cp. Pauly, *R.-E.* 1893, i. 970 ff. or (as a δεύτερος πλοῦς) *Dict. Antiq.*³ *sub v.* ILLUSTRATIONS, Baumeister, *Denkmäler der Klass. Alterth.*, *s. v.* ATHENE. See further *infr.*

ἐκ, 'after the fashion,' *à la mode*: but no other examples of this meaning are produced, nor do L. & S. notice it. In any case the statement of fact here made is plainly an (erroneous) inference from the following observation which is introduced by γάρ. Cp. c. 185 *supra*.

Λιβυσσέων. 'Native Libyan women' is generally understood.

ἐποιήσαντο. The natural force and meaning would be that the Hellenes in the first instance got the women of Libya to make them the dress for Athene.

3. **πλὴν κτλ.** The exception here is everything. The commentators seem to overlook the fact that the ἐσθής is not the same as the αἰγίδες. Hdt. goes so far as to say that the whole ἐσθής, the whole στολή of the statues of Athene, was of Libyan origin: this cannot be treated as a serious archaeological problem now. Whatever may be said in regard to the αἰγίς, the rest of Athene's attire, whether archaic or later, has nothing in common with Libyan leather. Cp. 5. 88 *infra*.

5. **τὰ ἄλλα πάντα.** Very vague. Are we to understand that the Libyan women wore leathern ἐσθής under their αἰγίδες, or that they wore nothing at all but the αἰγίδες with the leathern fringe? In Ethiopia (*teste* Wilkinson *apud* Rawl.) the αἰγίς has dwindled to a mere apron of thongs: see illustrations in Rawlinson. The use of such fringes is largely exemplified in Westermarck, *op. c.* c. ix., according to whose theory such things are not defensive but decorative.

6. **τὸ οὔνομα.** The argument, even if etymologically correct, does not prove the point: Hdt. should first have proved that αἰγίς is the native Libyan word. The derivation of αἰγίς is doubtful.

*αἰγέας γὰρ περιβάλλονται ψιλὰς περὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα θυσανωτὰς αἱ
Λίβυσσαι κεχριμένας ἐρευθεδάνῳ, ἐκ δὲ τῶν αἰγέων τουτέων αἰγί-
δας οἱ Ἕλληνες μετωνόμασαν. δοκέει δ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ὀλολυγὴ ἐν
ἱροῖσι ἐνθαῦτα πρῶτον γενέσθαι· κάρτα γὰρ ταύτῃ χρέωνται καλῶς
αἱ Λίβυσσαι. καὶ τέσσερας ἵππους συζευγνύναι παρὰ Λιβύων
οἱ Ἕλληνες μεμαθήκασι. θάπτουσι δὲ τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας οἱ* 190

Its connexion with *αἶξ* may be an early *Volksetymologie*, and the false etymology, the 'disease of language,' may have led to the investiture of Athene with a goat-skin breastplate. The fact that leathern armour was in common use, and the belief that the war-goddess would need her *lorica* as much as helmet or spear, would facilitate the artistic representation of the *αἰγίς* or (Cloud) *shield* of Zeus, or of Athene, by a *lorica*, or skin doublet. Whatever may be thought of meteorological mythology in general, the association of the *αἰγίς* with the weather seems incontrovertible (see Roscher, *Lexicon*, p. 150), and it looks as though the cloud became a breastplate in passing from poetry to sculpture.

8. **ἐρευθεδάνῳ.** The archaic statues of Athene found on the Akropolis (cp. Rhomaïdès, *Les Musées d'Athènes*, Livr. 1[e], 2[e]) were touched with vermilion: now alas! rapidly fading from exposure. Vermilion is still the favourite colouring in Tripoli and Marocco, see Rawlinson, note *ad l.* But such analogies do not prove causal connexion. The dye here mentioned is vegetable. Cp. c. 191 *infra*.

9. **δοκέει κτλ.** This sentence contains an hypothesis of Hdt.'s own invention, it may therefore be inferred that he had authority for the antecedent ascription of the Palladian costume and the Quadriga to Libya. The *ὀλολυγή* was proper to the worship of Athene, and presumably as ancient as the cult itself. Hom. *Il.* 6. 301. If introduced into Greece from outside, it was surely from the East. It is a cry of triumph or exultation (opposed to *κωκυτὸς* Eurip. *Med.* 1176, cp. L. & S.): perhaps connected with the Semitic Hallelu (which appears in Hallelu-iah).

11. **τέσσερας κτλ.** This statement has been generally sacrificed by commentators even the most loyal (cp. Rawlinson, note *ad l.*, R. Neumann, *op. cit.* p. 141), but on insufficient grounds. The four-horsed chariot is now no longer to be found in the genuine Homer, for *Il.* 8. 185 is obviously spurious, and *Il.* 11. 699 probably a late insertion (cp. W. Leaf, *Iliad*, note *ad l.*), 15. 679 is not a case in point, and *Od.* 13. 81 is a late insertion. That the Quadriga was used at the games of the 25th Olympiad = 680 B.C., cp. Clinton, *Fasti ad ann.* is rather more than Pausanias 5. 8, 3 expressly asserts, and in any case the statement (by Africanus *apud* Euseb.) must rest on inferences and combinations far from indisputable. It is even questionable whether the Olympian *ἀγὼν* itself was in existence, or at least of Panhellenic significance, as early as 680 B.C. (Cp. Bury, *Nemean Odes*, Appendix D, p. 258.) All that can be said against Hdt. on this score is that, assuming him to mean that the *τέθριππος* was introduced to the Greeks through Kyrene (cp. c. 170 *supra*), this statement conflicts—not with ascertained facts—but with the statement that the *τέθριππος* was used at Olympia in 680 B.C. This conflict is an argument against the chronologists rather than against Hdt., for if the quadriga was introduced at Olympia after the foundation of Kyrene, so much the worse for the chronology of the early Olympiads (cp. Mahaffy, On the authenticity of the Olympian Register, *J. H. S.* vol. ii., reprinted in *Problems in Greek History*, 1892). But Hdt. does not expressly say when the Greeks took this hint from the Libyans, or what Greeks first took it. The Libyan example was, it might be argued, borrowed either directly, or through Egypt, before the foundation of Kyrene, and even perhaps at a very early date, in the time of Libyan Pharaohs (cp. Appendix XII.). Clearly the statement in Hdt. is an inference, not a tradition: but it may be a sound inference, even though he was hardly entitled to make it. The assertion (Smith, *Dict. Antiq.*[3] *sub v.* Currus) that the Lydians drove four-horsed chariots appears to repose on a mistranslation of Aischylos, *Persae*, 47.

190. 1. **τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας.** The

νομάδες κατά περ οἱ Ἕλληνες, πλὴν Νασαμώνων· οὗτοι δὲ κατημένους θάπτουσι, φυλάσσοντες, ἐπεὰν ἀπιῇ τὴν ψυχήν, ὅκως μιν κατίσουσι μηδὲ ὕπτιος ἀποθανέεται. οἰκήματα δὲ σύμπηκτα ἐξ ἀνθερίκων ἐνειρμένων περὶ σχοίνους ἐστί, καὶ ταῦτα περιφορητά. νόμοισι μὲν τοιούτοισι οὗτοι χρέωνται.

191 Τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἑσπέρης τοῦ Τρίτωνος ποταμοῦ Αὐσέων ἔχονται ἀροτῆρες ἤδη Λίβυες καὶ οἰκίας νομίζοντες ἐκτῆσθαι, τοῖσι οὔνομα

---

present, not meaning 'the dying,' those *in articulo mortis*, but denoting a series or succession of acts, covered by θάπτουσι. Cp. τὰς ἀποθνησκούσας c. 180 *supra*.

2. **κατά περ οἱ Ἕλληνες**, without thereby implying that the practice of recumbent burial was borrowed on either side. It is only this one point which is in view, presumably.

The Nasamones practised Divination at the tombs of their ancestors, c. 172 *supra*, and the peculiar posture of the dead may be connected with their necromancy. Others, including the ancient Britons, have used the sitting-posture (Rawlinson *ad l.*).

3. **ἀπιῇ**, *sc.* ὁ ἀποθνήσκων, 'the dying man.'

4. **οἰκήματα.** Cp. Verg. *Georg.* 3. 340 with Conington's note. Sallust, *Jug.* 18, ceterum adhuc aedificia Numidarum agrestium quae mapalia illi vocant oblonga incurvis lateribus tecta quasi navium carinae sunt. The original form of the word was perhaps magaria. See Capes, *Sallust*, note *in l. c.* The resemblance to an inverted ship seems to have given rise to the story related in Sallust. For these tabernacles (περιφορητά) cp. φερέοικοι c. 46 *supra*.

191. 1. **Αὐσέων.** The Ausees, separated from the Machlyes by the river Triton, still belong to the Nomad Libyans, according to Hdt. Beyond the Ausees lie the Maxyes, with whom Agriculture begins. The situation of these tribes would be west and north of the Lake Tritonis, as the land here projects again in a way which Hdt. does not appear to realise. The Maxyes seem to occupy the district afterwards named Byzacium. They were mentioned in the *Periegesis* of Hekataios as Μάζυες, Müller, *Frag. Hek.* 304 (vol. i. p. 23). Saint-Martin *op. c.* p. 58 identifies them with the Maxitani of Justin, 18. 6, in whose territory Carthage was built. The establishment of the Tyrians there would naturally press the tribe down south. Aegyptologists see in the Maxues of Hdt. (or in the name) the descendants of the Maschuascha (Mašauaša, E. Meyer) who from the days of the 19th dynasty onward play a rôle of growing importance in Egyptian history, until finally they become the dominant power in the land (cp. Wiedemann, *Aeg. Gesch.* §§ 37 ff. and Appendix XII.).

2. **ἤδη.** Cp. c. 185 *supra*. This chapter carries us into the country west of the Lesser Syrtis, *i.e.* into the modern Tunis and Algeria. Physically and politically the region was in the days of Hdt. as it is in the present day separated and divided from the eastern parts of Libya. We pass here, so to speak, into the sphere of Carthaginian influence. Geographically the whole area between the Gulf of Cabes (Lesser Syrtis) on the east and the Atlantic on the west, and bounded by the Mediterranean on the north and the Desert on the south, is the Region of the Atlas, and is virtually a huge island, belonging rather to Europe than to Africa. Cp. Tristram, *The Great Sahara*, p. 360, "To the naturalist North Africa is but an European island" etc., and especially Grant Allen, in *Contemp. Review*, vol. 53 (1888), pp. 526 ff. Legend connected the population of the region with the Iberian peninsula, probably correctly (cp. Sallust, *Jug.* 18). The Arab conquest long obliterated the earlier relations of lands and peoples in the western Mediterranean, but the natural frontiers are now reasserting themselves.

This region is the true island of Atlantis, if the Greeks had only known it. A very remarkable fact is this, that the three zones, which are sought for in vain in eastern Libya, are found in Algeria and this region to perfection. See K. Johnston's *Africa*, c. ii. This scheme of parallel belts is specially conspicuous in Algeria; there

κέεται Μάξυες· οἳ τὰ ἐπὶ δεξιὰ τῶν κεφαλέων κομόωσι, τὰ δ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ κείρουσι, τὸ δὲ σῶμα χρίονται μίλτῳ. φασὶ δὲ οὗτοι εἶναι τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀνδρῶν. ἡ δὲ χώρη αὕτη τε καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ τῆς Λιβύης ἡ πρὸς ἑσπέρην πολλῷ θηριωδεστέρη τε καὶ δασυτέρη ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν νομάδων χώρης. ἡ μὲν γὰρ δὴ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ τῆς Λιβύης, τὴν οἱ νομάδες νέμουσι, ἔστι ταπεινή τε καὶ ψαμμώδης μέχρι τοῦ Τρίτωνος ποταμοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρην ἡ τῶν

"three belts may be clearly distinguished—the *Tell*, the region of uplands or steppes, and the Algerian Sahara," *op. c.* p. 18. The *Tell* is the arable and cultivated land. Cp. Tristram, *op. c.* p. 52, "it was needless for those who were masters of the Tell to invade the Sahara. As the southern nomads say of themselves, 'We are the subjects of our stomachs.' The Tell is their only granary, whence they procure corn by barter for wool, hides, dates, ostrich-feathers etc."

Could it be that Hdt.'s conception of Libya and its zones (c. 181 *supra*) is an extension and generalisation of the characteristics of that part of Africa under Carthaginian supremacy or influence, a knowledge of which he may have first acquired after his migration to Sicily? Or a dim vision of which may have been passed on to Egypt by Phoenicians or Hellenes?

4. **μίλτος** (**ἡ**) is red ochre, mineral: and so different from *ἐρευθέδανον*, c. 189 *supra*.

φασὶ κτλ. A few years ago this statement might have been dismissed as a purely Hellenic theory, resting on some merely fanciful or pragmatic combinations. Even now it can hardly be allowed to take rank as literal truth: but the fresh evidences and new methods of the last decade or two have very much modified the attitude of scholars to such statements, and we are disposed to see a larger and sounder deposit of historic fact in them than our predecessors were able to admit. 1. The *Asiatic* origin of a part of the population of 'Libya' is a tenable hypothesis. Cp. Appendix XII. 2. Whether a direct racial connexion existed between tribes of Libya and tribes of Asia Minor or not (cp. Wiedemann's denial of the identity of the Asiatic Schakalscha and the Libyan Schekelscha, *op. cit.* p. 499), it will be generally recognised that the Egyptian evidences open up possibilities of intercourse and contact between Libyans and minor-Asiatics, some traditions of which may very well underlie the theories regarding Trojan colonies in the west. That Hdt. had this particular statement from natives is less likely than that he had it from Graeco-Egyptian or Sikeliot sources, if indeed it was not due to Hekataios.

5. **ἡ δὲ χώρη κτλ.** Hdt. here commits himself to a description of the rest of Libya, *i.e.* the modern Tunis, Algeria, and Marocco, or Region of the Atlas. Blakesley thinks the account of the country and its terrors an exaggeration due to Carthaginians, who wished to keep the region to themselves. Rawlinson regards the passage as an accurate description of the general differences between the eastern and western regions of North Africa. It is, however, obvious that although Hdt. has an idea of a strong contrast between Libya east and west of 'Lake Tritonis,' he has no clear idea of the character of the west, nor does he suspect that the description which he has given of eastern Libya, applies much better to the west. There is, moreover, a slight inconsequence in his employing *ἡ θηριώδης* of the inner belt of his eastern Libya and here going on to describe western Libya as *πολλῷ θηριωδεστέρη*.

The Fauna and Flora of the Algerian Sahara are very fully described in Tristram, *op. c.* App. IV-VIII., and for a more general description of the products of North Africa, K. Johnston's *Africa*, pp. 28, 29.

The *Tell* is described now as planted with numerous forests as well as containing luxuriant pasture lands in addition to its fertile and arable settlements (*Africa*, p. 19). The second belt, behind the Tell and the Algerian range, is sandy, but supplies fodder, and in some favoured spots corn (*ib.* p. 20). This second belt as steppe land is succeeded by the Sahara.

ἀροτήρων ὀρεινή τε κάρτα καὶ δασέα καὶ θηριώδης· καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄφιες οἱ ὑπερμεγάθεες καὶ οἱ λέοντες κατὰ τούτους εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ ἐλέφαντές τε καὶ ἄρκτοι καὶ ἀσπίδες τε καὶ ὄνοι οἱ τὰ κέρεα ἔχοντες καὶ οἱ κυνοκέφαλοι καὶ οἱ ἀκέφαλοι οἱ ἐν τοῖσι στήθεσι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες, ὡς δὴ λέγονταί γε ὑπὸ Λιβύων, καὶ οἱ ἄγριοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες [ἄγριαι], καὶ ἄλλα πλήθεϊ πολλὰ θηρία
192 ἀκατάψευστα. κατὰ τοὺς νομάδας δέ ἐστι τούτων οὐδέν, ἀλλ'
ἄλλα τοιάδε, πύγαργοι καὶ ζορκάδες καὶ βουβάλιες καὶ ὄνοι, οὐκ
οἱ τὰ κέρεα ἔχοντες ἀλλ' ἄλλοι ἄποτοι (οὐ γὰρ δὴ πίνουσι), καὶ

---

12. **ἐλέφαντες.** Elephants are not now found in the north of Africa, but no doubt existed there in antiquity, cp. testimonies *apud* Baehr. The elephant's days in central Africa seem numbered now, cp. Drummond, *Tropical Africa*, pp. 19, 61.

ἄρκτοι. Whether bears were ever found in Africa is disputed: see Baehr's note *ad l.* Hdt. 2. 67 mentions them as rare in Egypt. The 'Dardanian' Akestes, at Eryx, wears the skin of a Libyan she-bear, Verg. *Aen.* 5. 37.

ἀσπίς, an asp, "Egyptian cobra," L. & S.

ὄνοι. Baehr suggests that the oryx, a species of antelope with one horn, is meant. See references in his note. But if Hdt. had been thinking of unicorns he would hardly have written *οἱ τὰ κέρεα ἔχοντες.*

13. **κυνοκέφαλοι** are described by Diodor. 3. 35 among the wild beasts of Aethiopia, next after the sphinx. They have ugly human bodies, and very savage tempers. One characteristic there noted might seem to suggest the Kangaroo.

ἀκέφαλοι κτλ. This description is too much for Hdt.'s credulity, as is shown by his adding the ultimate source (ὡς δὴ κτλ.) of the description, cp. c. 187 *supra.*

14. **οἱ ἄγριοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες.** Few will hesitate to identify these with the large apes of Africa, some report of which might easily have reached Magna Graecia, Egypt, or the Levant, for their skins had been seen at Carthage, Hanno, *Peripl.* 18 (*Geogr. Min.* i. 13 f.). Baehr, however, disputes this identification, and is so much offended by the harshness of the text (ἄνδρες . . καὶ ἄλλα . . θηρία), that he is strongly disposed to regard the words *οἱ ἄγριοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἄγριαι καὶ* as an interpolation. They are read in all the MSS. and even if ἄλλα and θηρία were not separated in the text, ἄλλα would not necessarily imply that ἄνδρες and γυναῖκες were θηρία (cp. ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι Luc. 23. 32, with Alford's note). See 5. 32, 67, 6. 121 *infra.* *ἄγριαι secl.* Stein.

15. **ἄλλα πλήθεϊ πολλά** covers a long catalogue, Hdt.'s list of authentic beasts being very short, and a marked contrast to the fuller details that follow in the next c. for eastern Libya.

Krüger follows Reiz in reading *καταψευστά.* The MS. reading is defensible; Hdt. has indicated his scepticism just above. But van Herwerden's suggestion *καὶ καταψευστὰ καὶ ἀκατάψευστα* avoids the dilemma.

192. 1. **τούτων οὐδέν.** The contrast between the fauna east and west of the Triton is certainly exaggerated. Foxes, jackals, and other beasts here confined to the east are, and probably were, found west of 'Triton': while among the *ἄλλα πολλὰ θηρία ἀκατάψευστα* of western Libya would surely be included some not unknown to the Greeks of Kyrene, Naukratis, or Thurii.

2. **πύγαργος** is mentioned by Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 618b as a kind of eagle. Here it appears to be a kind of antelope.

ζορκάδες. Baehr reads *δορκάδες* (cp. 7. 69), not without MSS. authority (*δορκέες* Holder β). R. tr. "gazelles."

βουβάλιες. R. renders "buffaloes." Buffaloes are found in N. Africa, but there is some doubt whether the *βούβαλις* was not a variety of antelope.

3. **ἄποτοι.** 4. 81 *supra* in a passive sense; here it is active (cp. *ἄμαχος et al.*). That any mammal should literally never drink seems incredible.

ὄρυες, τῶν τὰ κέρεα τοῖσι φοίνιξι οἱ πήχεες ποιεῦνται (μέγαθος δὲ τὸ θηρίον τοῦτο κατὰ βοῦν ἐστι), καὶ βασσάρια καὶ ὕαιναι καὶ ὕστριχες καὶ κριοὶ ἄγριοι καὶ δίκτυες καὶ θῶες καὶ πάνθηρες καὶ βόρυες, καὶ κροκόδειλοι ὅσον τε τριπήχεες χερσαῖοι, τῇσι σαύρῃσι ἐμφερέστατοι, καὶ στρουθοὶ κατάγαιοι, καὶ ὄφιες μικροί, κέρας ἓν ἕκαστος ἔχοντες· ταῦτά τε δὴ αὐτόθι ἐστὶ θηρία καὶ τά περ τῇ ἄλλῃ, πλὴν ἐλάφου τε καὶ ὑὸς ἀγρίου· ἔλαφος δὲ καὶ ὗς ἄγριος ἐν Λιβύῃ πάμπαν οὐκ ἔστι. μυῶν δὲ γένεα τριξὰ αὐτόθι ἐστί· οἱ μὲν δίποδες καλέονται, οἱ δὲ ζεγέριες (τὸ δὲ οὔνομα τοῦτό ἐστι

---

4. **ὄρυες.** Also a species of antelope, cp. Baehr's note.

φοίνιξ is named by Athenaios 636 (14. 38) among stringed instruments of music, in immediate conjunction with *πηκτὶς* and *μαγαδὶς* (*μάγαδις* L. & S.). It is mentioned in the same connexion p. 183 (4. 80), and in 637 (14. 40) *φοίνικα δὲ τὸ ὄργανον Ἔφορος καὶ Σκάμων (Σκάμνων) ἐν τοῖς περὶ Εὑρημάτων ὑπὸ Φοινίκων εὑρεθέντα ταύτης τυχεῖν τῆς προσηγορίας.*

πήχεες. The arms, or uprights, of the said Phoenician lyre. The cross-piece connecting them was the *ζυγόν* (L. & S.). The construction *τὰ κέρεα οἱ πήχεες ποιεῦνται* is remarkable. Cp. 8. 27 *ἡ δεκάτη ἐγένετο οἱ ἀνδριάντες.* The voice and number in the verb are also noteworthy.

5. **βασσάρια,** vulpeculae. *Βασσαρεύς* is a title of Bacchos in the wolf-skin: see Baehr *ad l.*

6. **ὕστριχες.** *Hystrix cristata*, porcupine.

δίκτυες. Not identified. Van Herwerden suggests *ἴκτιδες.*

θῶες. *Canis aureus*, jackal. In *Il.* 11. 474 the *Τρῶες* are compared to *θῶες.*

πάνθηρες. According to Baehr's authorities used here incorrectly for *πάρδαλις.* Panthers are not found in Africa: leopards are common.

7. **βόρυες.** Not identified. L. & S. compare *ὄρυες.*

κροκόδειλοι. This animal is apparently not a small crocodile but an 'immense lizard' (Wilkinson *apud* Rawlinson).

8. **ὄφιες.** No one apparently takes offence at these small horned-snakes.

9. **καὶ τά περ τῇ ἄλλῃ** is an emendation. The general MSS. reading is *ἅπερ τῇ ἄλλῃ.* P has *ἄλλα τῇ ἄλλῃ.* *ἄλλα τάπερ τῇ ἄλλῃ* would do fullest justice to the MSS. *τῇ ἄλλῃ* (*sc.* *γῇ*, *χώρῃ*) means 'elsewhere.' Cp. c. 192 *supra*, l. 1 *et al.*

11. **οὐκ ἔστι.** This statement must be regarded as exaggerated. The stag did not, however, occur perhaps in the Libya of Hdt. and the wild boar proper (*Sus scrofa*) is not found there, though cognate kinds are forthcoming. Authorities in Baehr and Rawlinson.

τριξά, *i. q.* *τρία*, cp. 1. 171.

12. **δίποδες.** Perhaps from their habit of standing on their hind-legs, which are longer than the fore-legs in the jerboa.

ζεγέριες interpreted by the author, if the following words *τὸ . . βουνοί* are genuine, as equivalent to *βουνοί.* In c. 199 *infra* where the author is describing, not three kinds of mice, but three seasons of the year, the words occur: *τῶν ὑπερθαλασσιδίων χώρων τὰ μέσα ὀργᾷ συγκομίζεσθαι τὰ βουνοὺς καλέουσι.* *βουνός* which is here mentioned as a familiar Greek word is there introduced as a local Kyrenaean term. Blakesley has a suggestive excursus on the word, which he is inclined to regard as a primitive Greek or 'Pelasgian' term for Mother Earth, and ventures to trace it in Gaelic, Latin, Old English and other tongues. The word has more usually been regarded as having been introduced from Africa into the Greek language. Whatever its origin it was not Attic, and was foreign or archaic in Hellas proper in the time of Hdt. But it was used at Kyrene (c. 199 *infra*), it was used in Sicily, and it is found in later Greek, LXX., Polybius (*βουνώδης*), Diodorus Siculus (*βουνοειδής*), Strabo and Pausanias. It was ridiculed as a foreign word by the comic poet Philemon. (1) Meineke, *F. G. C.* ed. mi. p. 830 = Eustathios ad Hom. 880. 30. (2)

μὲν Λιβυστικόν, δύναται δὲ κατ' Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν βουνοί), οἱ δὲ ἐχινέες. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ γαλαῖ ἐν τῷ σιλφίῳ γινόμεναι τῇσι Ταρτησσίῃσι ὁμοιόταται. τοσαῦτα μέν νυν θηρία ἡ τῶν νομάδων Λιβύων γῆ ἔχει, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἱστορέοντες ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἐξικέσθαι.

193 *Μαξύων δὲ Λιβύων Ζαύηκες ἔχονται, τοῖσι αἱ γυναῖκες ἡνιοχεῦσι*
194 *τὰ ἅρματα ἐς τὸν πόλεμον. τούτων δὲ Γύζαντες ἔχονται, ἐν τοῖσι*

Meineke, p. 850 = Phrynichos, *sub v.* (cp. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus*, pp. 459 ff.). Aischylos used the word *βοῦνις* after his visit to Sicily (*Supp.* 109, 756) where the word was probably early in vogue, perhaps through the connexion with Libya. Assuming this passage now before us, which occurs in all the MSS., to be genuine, we might see in the use of the word *βουνὸς* a further evidence of *Sicilian* influences on this portion of Hdt.'s text.

14. **ἐχινέες**, 'prickly mice,' so called from the stiffness of their hair: *ὀξείας ἀκάνθας ἔχοντας οὕσπερ οὖν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι καλοῦσιν ἐχενάτας.* Theophrast. *ap.* Baehr.

γαλαῖ. *γαλέαι* van H. Rawlinson states that the weasel appears on coins of Kyrene below the silphium, apparently after Baehr, after Wesseling, after Haym (*Thesaur. Brit.* ii. 124). Gazelle, jerboa, lion are given by Head (*Hist. Num.*) and Gardner (*Types of Greek Coins*), but no weasels.

τῇσι Ταρτησσίῃσι. We need not infer from this comparison that Hdt. was ever in Tartessos. It would be easier to bring a Spanish weasel to Thurii than the Greek historian to Spain. But it is not even necessary to suppose that Hdt. had seen either the weasel of Tartessos or that of Kyrene. It was enough that he had authority for the statement. Cp. Introduction, § 20.

15. **τοσαῦτα.** Among the beasts enumerated by Hdt. as inhabiting Africa the modern traveller would certainly miss the camel: it appears that the camel was not known in Libya until after the Arab conquest. Cp. *Enc. Brit.* iv. 737.

16. **ὅσον κτλ.** That his inquiries were conducted *an Ort und Stelle* is not asserted by Hdt., nor should we be justified in excluding written authorities from the range of his *ἱστορία*. Rather must it be admitted that, if there were any written authorities in existence, the claim advanced in these words would be exaggerated, unless the historian had consulted them too (*e.g.* Hekataios). Moreover, whether this passage was written or was left standing after Hdt. migrated to the west, we must suppose that he did not neglect to make himself acquainted in the west with those sources of information about Libya, which would certainly have been available there. Cp. Introduction, pp. xcvii. ff.

193. 1. **Μαξύων δέ**, c. 191 *supra.* The preceding excursus on the fauna has interrupted the ethnography. Saint-Martin, *op. cit.* p. 58, maintains that the Maxues are here spoken of in a more restricted sense than in c. 191, where the term is used generally for the Libyans west of the Syrtis Minor and would include these Maxues as well as the Zauekes and Gyzantes.

Ζαύηκες is the reading of α (A + B). β (R + V) has *Σάβυκες* (Holder). They were mentioned by Hekataios, *Frag.* 307 (Müller, i. 23). Saint-Martin p. 58 identifies them with the Zeugi of the Romans, who gave their name to Zeugitana, and Baehr note *ad l.* inclines to the same view. They reappear in the Zouaga who are found in the neighbourhood of Cabes at the date of the Arab conquest.

αἱ γυναῖκες. Diodor. 3. 52, 4 *γέγονε μὲν οὖν πλείω γένη γυναικῶν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην μάχιμα καὶ τεθαυμασμένα μεγάλως ἐπ' ἀνδρείᾳ.* Diod. proceeds to relate a legend of Libyan Amazons. Cp. c. 180 *supra.*

194. 1. **Γύζαντες**, *v. l.* *ζύγαντες* PR. Steph. Byz. has *Βύζαντες· Λίβυες περ[ὶ] Καρχηδόνα τῆς Λιβύης ἔθνος . . παρ[ὰ] Ἡροδότῳ δὲ κακῶς διὰ τοῦ γ, Γύζαντες.* Baehr accordingly identifies them with the tribe that gave its name to Byzacium. Saint-Martin however finds them again in the Zeggaoua, *tribe très-distinct[e] des Zouaga (Zeugi) bien qu'au temp[s] de la conquête musulmane elle habitâ[t] aussi le pays de Tripoli* (*op. c.* p. 59)

μέλι πολλὸν μὲν μέλισσαι κατεργάζονται, πολλῷ δ᾽ ἔτι πλέον
λέγεται δημιοεργοὺς ἄνδρας ποιέειν. μιλτοῦνται δ᾽ ὦν πάντες
οὗτοι καὶ πιθηκοφαγέουσι· οἱ δέ σφι ἄφθονοι ὅσοι ἐν τοῖσι ὄρεσι
γίνονται. κατὰ τούτους δὲ λέγουσι Καρχηδόνιοι κεῖσθαι νῆσον τῇ 195
οὔνομα εἶναι Κύραυιν, μῆκος μὲν διηκοσίων σταδίων, πλάτος δὲ
στεινήν, διαβατὸν ἐκ τῆς ἠπείρου, ἐλαιέων τε μεστὴν καὶ ἀμπέλων.
λίμνην δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ εἶναι, ἐκ τῆς αἱ παρθένοι τῶν ἐπιχωρίων πτεροῖσι
ὀρνίθων κεχριμένοισι πίσσῃ ἐκ τῆς ἰλύος ψῆγμα ἀναφέρουσι χρυσοῦ.
ταῦτα εἰ μέν ἐστι ἀληθέως οὐκ οἶδα, τὰ δὲ λέγεται γράφω· εἴη δ᾽
ἂν πᾶν, ὅκου καὶ ἐν Ζακύνθῳ ἐκ λίμνης καὶ ὕδατος πίσσαν ἀναφερο-

---

In this case they must have been displaced between the Roman time and the Musulman conquest. Their geographical situation (see next chapter) suits with the former identification.

2. **μέλι.** Genuine honey was all the more important in antiquity from the scarcity and inferiority of sugar. Other instances of the manufacture: 1. 193, 7. 31. Had this artificial honey a bad or a good name in Sicily and Magna Graecia? Cp. Steph. Byz. *sub v.* Ζυγαντίς.

3. **μιλτοῦνται.** Cp. c. 191 *supra*.

4. **πιθηκοφαγέουσι.** Oddly enough the apes have not been expressly mentioned among the fauna of Libya, c. 191 *supra*.

οἱ δέ, *sc. οἱ πίθηκοι.*

ἐν τοῖσι ὄρεσι. This phrase is astonishing, as Hdt. makes no use elsewhere (in his geography) of these mountains, which are, nevertheless, much needed on his map.

195. 1. **λέγουσι Καρχηδόνιοι.** The expression suggests that Hdt. had not visited the country; but it does not prove that he had conversed with Carthaginians, cp. next c. If he held any such converse, it might have been in Sicily: or the 'Carthaginian' account might have been gathered there. See Introduction, p. lxxviii.

2. **Κύραυιν.** Now generally identified with the island Cercina, modern Kerkenna or Kerk'na, in the gulf of Cabes, just opposite Sfaks, which fixes the district under review as identical with Byzacium. Meltzer, *Gesch. d. Karthager*, i. 77, 231, argues that a dim knowledge of the island of Kerne in the Atlantic is combined with a better knowledge of Cercina, to produce the Herodotean Kyrauis. From this point of view the description of the situation of Kerne, in the meridian of Carthage, is remarkable: cp. Hanno, *Periplus* 8 (*Geog. Min.* i. 7). R. Neumann (*Nordafrika*, 64 ff.) argues that the wine and oil are taken from Djerba: and concludes that the description of Kyrauis is a combination of points taken from Karkeneh, Djerba, and Kerne, or one of the other West African islands (gold).

3. **διαβατὸν ἐκ τ. ἠ.** is translated by Rawlinson: "soon reached from the mainland." Hdt. appears to mean that the passage between the land and the island is fordable. Cp. 1. 75 *ad fin.*

6. **ταῦτα μέν.** Hdt.'s scepticism is here much to the point, as there appears to be no evidence of any gold in the island, though gold perhaps was found in the interior of Africa. A more or less misunderstood method of procuring the gold dust may have been transferred to the site of exchange.

εἴη δ᾽ ἂν πᾶν. Cp. 5. 9, and Introduction, § 22.

7. **ὅκου,** 'since,' 'seeing that,' cp. 1. 68, 192, 7. 160.

Ζακύνθῳ. The tar springs of Zante are guaranteed by many authorities, ancient and modern: Ktesias, *Indic.* 10, Pliny, 35. 15; Chandler, Dodwell, Hawkins, among the moderns. Cp. quotation from Chandler, *apud* Rawlinson. Bursian, *Geogr. der Griechenl.* ii. 380 f., locates the chief tar well close to the S.W. coast, near Cape Chieri, and mentions a second curious phenomenon, an oil spring, rising in a grotto, or cave, only approachable from the sea, north of the east coast of the island. Hdt. may very well have visited Zante, *en route* for Thurii and the west. This allusion is a fresh confirmation of the hypothesis that the Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι betray western influences and were not compiled in Egypt and Kyrene (merely). Cp. Introduction, pp. xcvii ff.

λίμνης καὶ ὕδατος. There might

μένην αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὥρων. εἰσὶ μὲν καὶ πλεῦνες αἱ λίμναι αὐτόθι, ἡ δ' ὦν μεγίστη αὐτέων ἑβδομήκοντα ποδῶν πάντῃ, βάθος δὲ διόργυιός ἐστι· ἐς ταύτην κοντὸν κατιεῖσι ἐπ' ἄκρῳ μυρσίνην προσδήσαντες καὶ ἔπειτα ἀναφέρουσι τῇ μυρσίνῃ πίσσαν, ὀδμὴν μὲν ἔχουσαν ἀσφάλτου, τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῆς Πιερικῆς πίσσης ἀμείνω. ἐσχέουσι δὲ ἐς λάκκον ὀρωρυγμένον ἀγχοῦ τῆς λίμνης· ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀθροίσωσι συχνήν, οὕτω ἐς τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἐκ τοῦ λάκκου καταχέουσι. ὅ τι δ' ἂν ἐσπέσῃ ἐς τὴν λίμνην, ὑπὸ γῆν ἰὸν ἀναφαίνεται ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· ἡ δὲ ἀπέχει ὡς τέσσερα στάδια ἀπὸ τῆς λίμνης. οὕτω ὦν καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου τῆς ἐπὶ Λιβύῃ κειμένης οἰκότα ἐστὶ ἀληθείῃ.

196 *Λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τάδε Καρχηδόνιοι. εἶναι τῆς Λιβύης χῶρόν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἔξω Ἡρακλέων στηλέων κατοικημένους· ἐς*

---

have been no water in the *λίμνη*, hence the word is added. *λίμνη* is a curious word to apply to the object which other travellers have described as a 'well,' or 'spring.' "The spring most distinct and apt for inspection" is described by Chandler as four or five feet in diameter. There may have been seventy feet square of water or marsh-land round the well referred to by Hdt. The ground has apparently undergone change since his time, as the tar springs are now close to the coast (cp. Bursian, *op. cit. supra*). The tar is very poor, and there is no communication between the wells and the sea. Blakesley suggests that Hdt. was perhaps misled by the sight of the tar floating on the sea off the island. In 6. 119 a still more wonderful well is described, but Hdt. makes the more of the Zante springs, because he has seen them with his own eyes. Besides, he introduces this experience to confirm a Carthaginian story, feeling perhaps that Carthaginian authority did not rank high with Hellenes.

12. **ἀμείνω.** Didymus, *Geopon.* 6. 5 *τὴν πίσσαν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἡμῖν παραδεδώκασι καλλίστην εἶναι τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἴδης, μετὰ ταύτην τὴν ἐκ Πιερίας.* The former was preferred in Asia, but the latter in Greece. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 14. 20 (24).

13. **λάκκον,** cistern: cp. Aristoph. *Ekk.* 154; for waterfowl, 7. 119.

ὀρωρυγμένον. The so-called Attic reduplication, *ὀρώρυγμαι*, is more common than *ὤρυγμαι*. Cp. *ἀλάλημαι, ἀραίρηκα.*

14. **οὕτω κτλ.** The fact that there were tar wells in Zante, an island off Peloponnese, hardly goes far to prove that there was a gold well in Kyrauis an island off Libya, nor if a branch of myrtle was used to catch the pitch does it follow that a bunch of feathers would draw the gold. Speaking generally, however, it is a wonderful world, and one ought to be ready to believe a good deal about it (*εἴη δ' ἂν πᾶν*). Cp. Introduction, § 22.

196. 1. **λέγουσι.** Hdt. discounts the story by adducing the authority. That he had it direct from men of Carthage he does not assert (as for example Meltzer *op. cit.* p. 235 infers: der Umstand, dass Herodot diese Nachrichten nach eigner Angabe aus dem Munde von Karthagern erhalten hat u. s. w.). The reality of a 'dumb commerce' of the kind described in this chapter is fully borne out by modern authorities, instances being adduced from the Sudan, *i.e.* the region of Africa between the desert of Sahara and the Equator. Senegambia or the Gold Coast would answer to the geographical indications in the Carthaginian story, which *inter alia* goes to show that the Carthaginians had more extensive dealings with native Africa than was always suspected. The *Periplus* of Hanno (Müller, *Geogr. Minor.* i. pp. 1-14) points to the same conclusion. Modern authorities are cited in Baehr and Rawlinson. Meltzer (*op. cit.* p. 234) speaking of Hdt.'s knowledge of the further west observes that it is not to be supposed that Hdt. had the *Periplus* of Hanno in his hands: but none the less his information may be ultimately due to Hanno's expedition.

τοὺς ἐπεὰν ἀπίκωνται καὶ ἐξέλωνται τὰ φορτία, θέντες αὐτὰ ἐπεξῆς παρὰ τὴν κυματώγην, ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰ πλοῖα τύφειν καπνόν. τοὺς δ' ἐπιχωρίους ἰδομένους τὸν καπνὸν ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἔπειτα ἀντὶ τῶν φορτίων χρυσὸν τιθέναι καὶ ἐξαναχωρέειν πρόσω ἀπὸ τῶν φορτίων. τοὺς δὲ Καρχηδονίους ἐκβάντας σκέπτεσθαι, καὶ ἢν μὲν φαίνηταί σφι ἄξιος ὁ χρυσὸς τῶν φορτίων, ἀνελόμενοι ἀπαλλάσσονται, ἢν δὲ μὴ ἄξιος, ἐσβάντες ὀπίσω ἐς τὰ πλοῖα κατέαται· οἱ δὲ προσελθόντες ἄλλον πρὸς ὧν ἔθηκαν χρυσόν, ἐς οὗ ἂν πείθωσι. ἀδικέειν δὲ οὐδετέρους· οὔτε γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἅπτεσθαι πρὶν ἄν σφι ἀπισωθῇ τῇ ἀξίῃ τῶν φορτίων, οὔτ' ἐκείνους τῶν φορτίων ἅπτεσθαι πρότερον ἢ αὐτοὶ τὸ χρυσίον λάβωσι.

Οὗτοι μέν εἰσι τοὺς ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν Λιβύων ὀνομάσαι, καὶ 197
τούτων οἱ πολλοὶ βασιλέος τοῦ Μήδων οὔτε τι νῦν οὔτε τότε ἐφρόντιζον οὐδέν. τοσόνδε δὲ ἔτι ἔχω εἰπεῖν περὶ τῆς χώρης ταύτης, ὅτι τέσσερα ἔθνεα νέμεται αὐτὴν καὶ οὐ πλέω τούτων, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, καὶ τὰ μὲν δύο αὐτόχθονα τῶν ἐθνέων τὰ δὲ δύο οὔ, Λίβυες μὲν καὶ Αἰθίοπες αὐτόχθονες, οἱ μὲν τὰ πρὸς βορέω οἱ δὲ τὰ πρὸς νότου τῆς Λιβύης οἰκέοντες, Φοίνικες δὲ καὶ Ἕλληνες ἐπήλυδες.

---

12. **αὐτούς.** Bekker suggests *αὐτοί* which would be the normal construction, as in c. 137 *supra λέγοντος οὔτε αὐτὸς κτλ.* The converse case is found as Stein points out in 1. 56 *οὐδ' ὧν αὐτὸς οὐδὲ οἱ* (instead of *τοὺς*) *ἐξ αὐτοῦ παύσεσθαί κοτε τῆς ἀρχῆς.* The whole chapter before us is an interesting example of the sustained oratio obliqua, and a slight grammatical lapse towards the end would not be un-Herodotean.

197. 1. **οὗτοι μέν.** The words do not refer to the passage immediately preceding, but to c. 194, or even c. 191 *supra.* Cp. c. 167 *supra ad fin.* **νῦν** again was a challenge to the commentator. Can we be even quite sure that the *νῦν* here was of date strictly contemporaneous with the *νῦν* there? *i.e.* belonged both originally to the same draft or stratum of the *Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι.* Certainly a revision or second edition would synchronise the two, by bringing both down to a common later era. The composition of this part is highly problematic: cp. Introduction, p. xcvii.

Λιβύων. The Libyans of Hdt. may be taken to represent the whole Berber stock of North Africa, though the name Libu originally denoted only one powerful tribe or group in the neighbourhood of Egypt. The Aethiopians represent the dark inhabitants of the Sudan. Hdt. does not think it necessary to multiply his native races in order to classify such tribes as he has mentioned 2. 32, or c. 191 *supra.* Egyptians he does not mention, as Egypt is not with him strictly speaking a part of Libya 2. 17, cp. c. 41 *supra,* albeit the statement, c. 42, that Libya is circumnavigable, involves the inclusion of Egypt in the continent. The Phoenicians are of course represented by Carthage, and the Hellenes by Kyrene, or the Pentapolis. The ethnography of this passage agrees with that of 2. 32; the Aethiopians must be supplied from 3. 17 ff. (Macrobii), 3. 97 (*οἱ πρόσουροι Αἰγύπτῳ,* cp. 7. 69), and c. 183 *supra* (Troglodytae). (Asiatic Aethiopians are included in the army list of Xerxes 7. 70, cp. 3. 94.) On the modern Ethnology of Africa, see K. Johnston, *Africa,* Appendix I.

5. **ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.** Cp. Introduction, p. civ. The words are something more than a mere form here, Hdt. plainly holding that the continent was not fully explored. Cp. cc. 41-43 *supra.*

198 Δοκέει δέ μοι οὐδ' ἀρετὴν εἶναί τις ἡ Λιβύη σπουδαίη ὥστε ἢ
Ἀσίῃ ἢ Εὐρώπῃ παραβληθῆναι, πλὴν Κίνυπος μούνης· τὸ γὰρ
δὴ αὐτὸ οὔνομα ἡ γῆ τῷ ποταμῷ ἔχει. αὕτη δὲ ὁμοίη τῇ ἀρίστῃ
γέων Δήμητρος καρπὸν ἐκφέρειν οὐδὲ ἔοικε οὐδὲν τῇ ἄλλῃ Λιβύῃ.
μελάγγαιός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἔπυδρος πίδαξι, καὶ οὔτε αὐχμοῦ
φροντίζουσα οὐδὲν οὔτε ὄμβρον πλέω πιοῦσα δεδήληται· ὕεται
γὰρ δὴ ταῦτα τῆς Λιβύης. τῶν δὲ ἐκφορίων τοῦ καρποῦ ταὐτὰ
μέτρα τῇ Βαβυλωνίῃ γῇ κατίσταται. ἀγαθὴ δὲ γῆ καὶ τὴν
Εὐεσπερῖται νέμονται· ἐπ' ἑκατοστὰ γάρ, ἐπεὰν αὐτὴ ἑωυτῆς
199 ἄριστα ἐνείκῃ, ἐκφέρει, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῇ Κίνυπι ἐπὶ τριηκόσια. ἔχει
δὲ καὶ ἡ Κυρηναίη χώρη, ἐοῦσα ὑψηλοτάτη ταύτης τῆς Λιβύης
τὴν οἱ νομάδες νέμονται, τρεῖς ὥρας ἐν ἑωυτῇ ἀξίας θώματος.
πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ τὰ παραθαλάσσια [τῶν καρπῶν] ὀργᾷ ἀμᾶσθαί τε
καὶ τρυγᾶσθαι· τούτων τε δὴ συγκεκομισμένων τὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν
θαλασσιδίων χώρων τὰ μέσα ὀργᾷ συγκομίζεσθαι, τὰ βουνοὺς
καλέουσι· συγκεκόμισταί τε οὗτος ὁ μέσος καρπὸς καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ
κατυπερτάτῃ τῆς γῆς πεπαίνεταί τε καὶ ὀργᾷ, ὥστε ἐκπέποταί τε

---

198. 1. **δοκέει δέ μοι κτλ.** The tri-continental system is here endorsed by Hdt. for practical purposes. Cp. c. 45 *supra*.

2. **Κίνυπος.** Described above c. 175 as in the territory of the Makae, flowing from the λόφος Χαρίτων. The district is just, so to speak, between the Greater and the Lesser Syrtis. Cp. note *ad l.* The utterances here on the Kinyps *region* seem an afterthought, an addition, to the remarks on the *river* there. This effort in comparative geography may have been suggested to Hdt. after his visit to the west, Sicily and Magna Graecia and the Pontos regions being the best corn-growing regions of *Europe* known to him, while the references to Babylonia seem to justify the inference that this passage was written or revised subsequently to 1. 193, the very language of this passage reproducing the language of that: Δήμητρος καρπὸν ἐκφέρειν.

6. **φροντίζουσα οὐδέν.** A careless echo from c. 197 *supra*.

ὕεται, passive. Hdt. of course knew nothing of the heavy rainfall of tropical Africa. Cp. Keith Johnston's *Africa*, Appendix II. on the Distribution of rain in Africa. "In Marocco and Algeria . . . the west winds of the north Atlantic provide the winter rains; . . . on the coasts of Tripoli and Egypt the scanty winter rains seem to be supplied from the vapours of the Mediterranean itself," *op. c.* p. 571, and cp. pp. 572-574.

9. **Εὐεσπερῖται,** cc. 171 *supra*, 204 *infra*. It is now Benghazi (Berenice) the second town of Tripoli.

199. 2. **ὑψηλοτάτη.** Here again we have a postscript, which corresponds well to the facts, the Kyrenaica being a high plateau of rocks "projecting in a solid mass into the Mediterranean. . . . This plateau gradually descends towards the Egyptian frontier." The height of the upper plateau is estimated at 1700-1800 feet. Hdt. does not, however, appear to be aware that higher points existed even within his nomad Libya in the ranges of the Black Mountains, or Jebel es Soda, and Harutsh, which attain an elevation of 2800 feet (Johnston, *Africa*, p. 69).

3. **τρεῖς ὥρας.** Modern travellers confirm the general truth of this statement: Baehr cites Pacho, Beechey, Russell, Barth; Rawlinson adds a quotation from Hamilton. The three 'seasons' correspond to three 'steppes' or levels rising from the sea inland a characteristic of the country not previously noted by Hdt. (1) τὰ παραθαλάσσια or θαλασσίδια, (2) τὰ μέσα, or βουνοί, (3) ἡ κατυπερτάτη.

4. **τῶν κάρπων** *del.* Gomperz.

6. **βουνούς,** cp. c. 192 *supra*.

8. **ἐκπέποται.** The wine would have been quickly made and consumed

καὶ καταβέβρωται ὁ πρῶτος καρπὸς καὶ ὁ τελευταῖος συμπαραγίνεται. οὕτω ἐπ' ὀκτὼ μῆνας Κυρηναίους ὀπώρη ἐπέχει. ταῦτα μέν νυν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω.

Οἱ δὲ Φερετίμης τιμωροὶ Πέρσαι ἐπείτε ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου 200
σταλέντες ὑπὸ Ἀρυάνδεω ἀπίκατο ἐς τὴν Βάρκην, ἐπολιόρκεον τὴν πόλιν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι ἐκδιδόναι τοὺς αἰτίους τοῦ φόνου τοῦ Ἀρκεσίλεω· τῶν δὲ πᾶν γὰρ ἦν τὸ πλῆθος μεταίτιον, οὐκ ἐδέκοντο τοὺς λόγους. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ἐπολιόρκεον τὴν Βάρκην ἐπὶ μῆνας ἐννέα, ὀρύσσοντές τε ὀρύγματα ὑπόγαια φέροντα ἐς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ προσβολὰς καρτερὰς ποιεύμενοι. τὰ μέν νυν ὀρύγματα ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς ἀνεῦρε ἐπιχάλκῳ ἀσπίδι, ὧδε ἐπιφρασθείς· περιφέρων αὐτὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχεος προσῖσχε πρὸς τὸ δάπεδον τῆς πόλιος. τὰ μὲν δὴ ἄλλα ἔσκε κωφὰ πρὸς τὰ προσῖσχε, κατὰ δὲ τὰ ὀρυσσόμενα ἠχέεσκε ὁ χαλκὸς τῆς ἀσπίδος. ἀντορύσσοντες δ' ἂν ταύτῃ οἱ Βαρκαῖοι ἔκτεινον τῶν Περσέων τοὺς γεωρυχέοντας. τοῦτο μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἐξευρέθη, τὰς δὲ προσβολὰς ἀπεκρούοντο οἱ
Βαρκαῖοι. χρόνον δὲ δὴ πολλὸν τριβομένων καὶ πιπτόντων 201
ἀμφοτέρων πολλῶν καὶ οὐκ ἧσσον τῶν Περσέων, Ἄμασις ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ πεζοῦ μηχανᾶται τοιάδε. μαθὼν τοὺς Βαρκαίους ὡς κατὰ μὲν τὸ ἰσχυρὸν οὐκ αἱρετοὶ εἶεν, δόλῳ δὲ αἱρετοί, ποιέει τοιάδε· νυκτὸς τάφρην ὀρύξας εὐρέαν ἐπέτεινε ξύλα ἀσθενέα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, κατύπερθε δὲ ἐπιπολῆς τῶν ξύλων χοῦν γῆς ἐπεφόρησε, ποιέων τῇ ἄλλῃ γῇ ἰσόπεδον. ἅμα ἡμέρῃ δὲ ἐς λόγους προε-

---

none of the first was left when the last vintage was ripe. Hdt. seems to exaggerate somewhat with his prepositions *ἐκ*, *κατά*.

9. **καί.** With the form of construction cp. c. 181 *supra* *μεσαμβρίη τέ ἐστι καὶ τὸ κάρτα γίνεται ψυχρὸν κτλ.* c. 53 *supra*.

200. 1. **οἱ . . Πέρσαι.** The narrative is resumed from c. 167 *supra*. Hdt. has not previously specified any as Persians except the two commanders: unless *στρατὸν τὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἅπαντα* c. 167 *supra* were to include the Persian garrisons: but cp. l. 12 *infra*.

3. **ἐπαγγελλόμενοι,** commanding, or, perhaps, demanding: cp. c. 119 *supra*, 5. 98 *infra*, and the gloss in Suidas: *ἐπαγγέλλεται· παρακαλεῖ, ἀξιοῖ. οὕτως Ἡρόδοτος.* (Cp. Dem. *Or.* 19. 193.)

5. **ἐπολιόρκεον.** The nine months' siege of Barke (*c.* 512 B.C. ?) was apparently memorable for the mining operations still at that time unfamiliar to Greeks in warfare. Mining was the Assyrian alternative to Battering as practised by Greeks and Romans (Rawlinson, who refers to Livy 4. 22, 5. 19), and is frequently represented on Assyrian sculpture. Cp. 5. 115, 6. 18 *infra* (Bl.). Aeneas Poliorceticus c. 37 relates the story here told as illustrating one of the ways of hindering mining, without hinting that the Amasis, whom he names, was a Persian.

8. **ἐπιχάλκῳ.** One would suppose that a shield entirely of metal would have answered the purpose best and the word is so understood here. Hdt. 9. 80 speaks of *κλῖναι ἐπίχρυσοι καὶ ἐπάργυροι* which he speaks of in 9. 82 as *χρύσεαι καὶ ἀργύρεαι*.

12. **Περσέων** cannot be pressed so as to mean that the soldiers were genuine Persians: it is enough that they be Persian subjects.

201. 1. **χρόνον δὲ δή,** viz. the nine months specified in preceding chapter.

καλέετο τοὺς Βαρκαίους· οἱ δὲ ἀσπαστῶς ὑπήκουσαν, ἐς ὃ σφι ἕαδε ὁμολογίῃ χρήσασθαι. τὴν δὲ ὁμολογίην ἐποιεῦντο τοιήνδε τινά, ἐπὶ τῆς κρυπτῆς τάφρου τάμνοντες ὅρκια, ἔστ᾽ ἂν ἡ γῆ αὕτη οὕτω ἔχῃ, μένειν τὸ ὅρκιον κατὰ χώρην, καὶ Βαρκαίους τε ὑποτελέειν φάναι ἀξίην βασιλέι καὶ Πέρσας μηδὲν ἄλλο νεοχμοῦν κατὰ Βαρκαίους. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ὅρκιον Βαρκαῖοι μὲν πιστεύσαντες τούτοισι αὐτοί τε ἐξήισαν ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἔων παριέναι ἐς τὸ τεῖχος τὸν βουλόμενον, τὰς πάσας πύλας ἀνοίξαντες· οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι καταρρήξαντες τὴν κρυπτὴν γέφυραν ἔθεον ἔσω ἐς τὸ τεῖχος. κατέρρηξαν δὲ τοῦδε εἵνεκα τὴν ἐποίησαν γέφυραν, ἵνα ἐμπεδορκέοιεν, ταμόντες τοῖσι Βαρκαίοισι χρόνον μένειν αἰεὶ τὸ ὅρκιον ὅσον ἂν ἡ γῆ μένῃ κατὰ τότε εἶχε· καταρ-
202 ρήξασι δὲ οὐκέτι ἔμενε τὸ ὅρκιον κατὰ χώρην. τοὺς μέν νυν αἰτιωτάτους τῶν Βαρκαίων ἡ Φερετίμη, ἐπείτε οἱ ἐκ τῶν Περσέων παρεδόθησαν, ἀνεσκολόπισε κύκλῳ τοῦ τείχεος, τῶν δέ σφι γυναικῶν τοὺς μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα περιέστιξε καὶ τούτοισι τὸ τεῖχος· τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς τῶν Βαρκαίων ληίην ἐκέλευε θέσθαι τοὺς Πέρσας, πλὴν ὅσοι αὐτῶν ἦσαν Βαττιάδαι τε καὶ τοῦ φόνου οὐ μεταίτιοι· τούτοισι δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἐπέτρεψε ἡ Φερετίμη.

203 Τοὺς ὦν δὴ λοιποὺς τῶν Βαρκαίων οἱ Πέρσαι ἀνδραποδισάμενοι ἀπήισαν ὀπίσω· καὶ ἐπείτε ἐπὶ τῇ Κυρηναίων πόλι ἐπέστησαν, οἱ Κυρηναῖοι λόγιόν τι ἀποσιεύμενοι διεξῆκαν αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ

---

18. **ἵνα ἐμπεδορκέοιεν.** To Greek and, if we believe this story, Persian ideas perjury was not perpetrated if the letter of an oath were observed, however completely the spirit might be disregarded. Cp. c. 154 *supra*. That Spartans were sometimes given to this sort of scrupulous duplicity may be seen not merely from the well-known case of Kleomenes and the Argives (cp. 6. 76 ff., notes) but from the anecdotes of Derkyllidas and Thibron preserved in the *Excerpta Polyaeni* 39. 2, 3 (*Biblioth. Teubner*. ed. Melber, p. 477). See further L. Schmidt, *Die Ethik der alten Griechen*, ii. 5 ff.

202. 6. **πλὴν ὅσοι.** This is the first clear mention of any of the Battiad family or party in Barke: but it implies that the record of the proceedings is anything but complete, cp. c. 164 *supra*. What there was left of the city to entrust to them after the murderers of Arkesilaos had been atrociously penalised and all the rest spoiled by the Persians hardly appears: perhaps the extent to which the common folk of Barke sympathised with the anti-Battiad, anti-tyrannic, anti-Medic, and presumably aristocratic or oligarchic party, has been exaggerated in the traditions (cc. 167, 200 *supra*).

203. 3. **οἱ Κυρηναῖοι.** This story of the deliverance of Kyrene from the fate of Barke is "exceedingly improbable" (as even Rawlinson iii. 175 has observed), not to say, transparently fictitious. It is likely enough that the Persian expedition was not directed against Kyrene, that city being the humble servant of the Persian king (c. 165 *supra*): it is likely enough that Kyrene opened its gates to the Persians, and supplied them with provisions. It is not likely that any attack was made on Kyrene. If Kyrene had been in rebellion against the Persian king, or Egyptian governor, its reduction would have been included in the commission of Amasis and Badres. The appearance of the admiral on the scene is suspicious: but he is wanted to help out the action, and his presence is probably as fictitious as the oracle (λόγιόν τι), the panic (Λύκειος = Pan), and the special messenger. The story in short is a fraud on history, due to the pragmatic

ἄστεος. διεξιούσης δὲ τῆς στρατιῆς Βάδρης μὲν ὁ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ στρατοῦ στρατηγὸς ἐκέλευε αἱρέειν τὴν πόλιν, Ἄμασις δὲ ὁ τοῦ πεζοῦ οὐκ ἔα· ἐπὶ Βάρκην γὰρ ἀποσταλῆναι μούνην Ἑλληνίδα πόλιν· ἐς ὃ διεξελθοῦσι καὶ ἱζομένοισι ἐπὶ Διὸς Λυκαίου ὄχθον μετεμέλησέ σφι οὐ σχοῦσι τὴν Κυρήνην. καὶ ἐπειρῶντο τὸ δεύτερον παριέναι ἐς αὐτήν· οἱ δὲ Κυρηναῖοι οὐ περιώρων. τοῖσι δὲ Πέρσῃσι οὐδενὸς μαχομένου φόβος ἐνέπεσε, ἀποδραμόντες τε ὅσον τε ἑξήκοντα στάδια ἵζοντο· ἱδρυθέντι δὲ τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ταύτῃ ἦλθε παρὰ Ἀρυάνδεω ἄγγελος ἀποκαλέων αὐτούς. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι Κυρηναίων δεηθέντες ἐπόδιά σφι δοῦναι ἔτυχον, λαβόντες δὲ ταῦτα ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον. παραλαβόντες δὲ τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν αὐτοὺς Λίβυες τῆς τε ἐσθῆτος εἵνεκα καὶ τῆς σκευῆς τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπελκομένους ἐφόνευον, ἐς ὃ ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἀπίκοντο.

Οὗτος ὁ Περσέων στρατὸς τῆς Λιβύης ἑκαστάτω ἐς Εὐεσπερίδας ἦλθε. 204 τοὺς δὲ ἠνδραποδίσαντο τῶν Βαρκαίων, τούτους δὲ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀνασπάστους ἐποίησαν παρὰ βασιλέα, βασιλεὺς δέ σφι Δαρεῖος ἔδωκε τῆς Βακτρίης χώρης κώμην ἐγκατοικῆσαι. οἱ δὲ τῇ κώμῃ ταύτῃ οὔνομα ἔθεντο Βάρκην, ἥ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν οἰκεομένη ἐν γῇ τῇ Βακτρίῃ.

---

fancy of the Kyrenaeans, or their friends, and devised long after the events, at a time when it was to the credit of Kyrene to believe and get it believed that she had not medised, but had had her own brush with the Persian, even before the days of Marathon and Salamis. According to Polyainos 8. 47, the expedition of Pheretime was directed against the 'Kyrenaeans,' but the passage is in general terms, and insufficient to override the facts implied in the Herodotean story.

7. **Διὸς Λυκαίου.** *Λυκάων δὲ ὁ Πελασγοῦ τοσάδε εὗρεν ἢ ὁ πατὴρ οἱ σοφώτερα· Λυκόσουράν τε γὰρ πόλιν ᾤκισεν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Λυκαίῳ, καὶ Δία ὠνόμασε Λυκαῖον, καὶ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε Λύκαια.* Pausan. 8. 2, 1. The presence of the Arkadian deity or deities at Kyrene speaks volumes for the ethnic character of the population, and would lead us to expect the presence of other than Dorian *νόμιμα*. Cp. c. 161 *supra*. On Zeus Lykaios, cp. W. Immerwahr, *Kulte u. Mythen Arkadiens*, i. 1-24. On Pan cp. n. 6. 105 *infra*.

204. 1. **ἐς Εὐεσπερίδας.** This statement, perhaps a genuine reminiscence, militates against the idea employed in the previous c. that Barke was the only goal of the expedition, and betrays the imperfection of the record.

Some Greek captives from Libya may have been an encouraging and appropriate offering to Dareios, after his own expedition into Europe. The king's treatment of these Barkaians anticipated the treatment accorded to the Eretrians, some two or three and twenty years after, 6. 119 *infra*. This chapter also in the words *ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν* suggests problems similar to those raised by the parallel passage: viz., whether our author had visited the place in Bactria referred to here; if so, at what date; whether *ἔτι κτλ.* refers to the date of any such visit, or the date of composition, or more generally the author's birth, and so forth. But in all such cases it will be found that the autobiographical date carries with it no conclusion as to the autoptic or other character of the evidence (cp. c. 124 *supra*), a problem to be decided on other grounds: see Introduction, § 21, and this passage does not justify the inference that Hdt. was ever at Barke in Baktria. With *ἔδωκε κώμην ἐγκατοικῆσαι* cp. 6. 90 *infra*.

205 *Οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ ἡ Φερετίμη εὖ τὴν ζόην κατέπλεξε. ὡς γὰρ δὴ τάχιστα ἐκ τῆς Λιβύης τισαμένη τοὺς Βαρκαίους ἀπενόστησε ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον, ἀπέθανε κακῶς· ζῶσα γὰρ εὐλέων ἐξέζεσε, ὡς ἄρα ἀνθρώποισι αἱ λίην ἰσχυραὶ τιμωρίαι πρὸς θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι γίνονται. ἐκ μὲν δὴ Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττου τοιαύτη τε καὶ τοσαύτη τιμωρίη ἐγένετο ἐς Βαρκαίους.*

---

205. 2. ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον. If Pheretime really returned to Egypt and died there shortly (*circa* 510 B.C. ?) her fate and story may have been told in Egypt with the appropriate Greek moral which concludes it (cp. Introduction, § 22). But she left a grandson, Battos, on the throne in Kyrene, of whom these pragmatic traditions take no account (except *implicite* in the oracle c. 163 *supra*). She can hardly therefore have been "afraid of remaining in the Cyrenaica" (Rawl.). Perhaps she looked to Egypt not merely for political but for medical aid. She died worm-eaten (*σκωληκόβρωτος*), and an end so disgusting implied (to a pious Greek) a divine judgment, a previous transgression. The tale of the *τίσις*, or *τιμωρίη ἐς Βαρκαίους*, supplied what was wanted. Blakesley *ad l.* gives a list of illustrious victims of the loathsome malady.

5. τῆς Βάττου. She was the wife of one Battos and the grandmother of another. Baehr suggests that she may have been the daughter of a third. Stein supplies *γυναικὸς* and compares *das homerische* Ἕκτορος Ἀνδρομάχη. I have not been able to discover the expression in *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Wesseling's note *ad l.* runs: Id nollem, turpem Vallae errorem, quo Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττεω *Pheretimae Batti filiae*, per omnes editiones sine animadversione propagari . . . Vertenti *Laurentio* non observabatur Ἕκτορος Ἀνδρομάχη, etc., etc. Vergil seems to be the author of the phrase *Hectoris Andromache*, *Aen.* 3. 319. Bouhier, who was the first to take exception to Valla's *filiae* (*Recherches et Dissertations sur Herodote*, Dijon 1746, p. 146), only gives a reference to "the grammarians, among others Lambert Bos, *Myster. Ellips. Graec.*," to prove that in such cases *γυνὴ* is to be supplied. But cp. R. Kühner, *Ausf. Grammatik d. gr. Sp.* § 414. 2, who only gives the Vergilian instance. It looks as if Wesseling had started this hare by a *lapsus memoriae*. The genitive in *Hectoris Andromachen* (*sic*) is better taken as possessive, not as elliptical. Cp. Conington, note *ad l. c.*

ΤΕΡΨΙΧΟΡΗ

1 Οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ τῶν Περσέων καταλειφθέντες ὑπὸ Δαρείου, τῶν ὁ Μεγάβαζος ἦρχε, πρώτους μὲν Περινθίους Ἑλλησποντίων οὐ βουλομένους ὑπηκόους εἶναι Δαρείου κατεστρέψαντο, περιεφθέντας πρότερον καὶ ὑπὸ Παιόνων τρηχέως. οἱ γὰρ ὦν ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος Παίονες χρήσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ Περινθίους, καὶ ἢν μὲν ἀντικατιζόμενοι ἐπικαλέσωνταί σφεας οἱ Περίνθιοι ὀνομαστὶ βώσαντες, τοὺς δὲ ἐπιχειρέειν, ἢν δὲ μὴ ἐπιβώσωνται, μὴ ἐπιχειρέειν, ἐποίεον οἱ Παίονες ταῦτα. ἀντικατιζομένων δὲ τῶν Περινθίων ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ, ἐνθαῦτα μουνομαχίη τριφασίη ἐκ προκλήσιός σφι ἐγένετο· καὶ γὰρ ἄνδρα ἀνδρὶ καὶ ἵππον ἵππῳ συνέβαλον καὶ κύνα κυνί. νικώντων δὲ τὰ δύο τῶν Περινθίων, ὡς ἐπαιώνιζον κεχαρηκότες, συνεβάλοντο οἱ Παίονες τὸ χρηστήριον αὐτὸ τοῦτο εἶναι καὶ εἶπάν κου παρὰ σφίσι αὐτοῖσι "νῦν ἂν εἴη ὁ χρησμὸς ἐπιτελεόμενος ἡμῖν, νῦν ἡμέτερον ἔργον." οὕτω τοῖσι Περινθίοισι παιωνίσασι

---

1. 1. **οἱ δὲ κτλ.** The material reference is back to Book 4, c. 144: the grammatical to the last sentence of Bk. 4 (*ἐκ μὲν δὴ κτλ.*). The Persians in Europe are contrasted with the Persians in Libya. The continuity of Bks. 4 and 5 is thus fully established. On the division cp. 6. 1 note, and Introduction, § 2.

Περσέων, 80,000 strong, 4. 143 *supra*, but of course not all Persians proper, 4. 200 etc.

2. **πρώτους.** This passage appears to imply that Perinthos and the Hellespontians had not been previously reduced by Dareios: the priority might, however, be taken to refer to the operations of Megabazos. Byzantion was the base of operation against Thrace and the west: yet the fleet of Dareios had passed freely through the Hellespont proper, thanks no doubt in part to Miltiades. Cp. c. 2 *infra*. On the king's route through Thrace, cp. 4. 89 ff. and Appendix IV. § 4.

Ἑλλησποντίων here includes all west of Byzantion, cp. 4. 38, 89, etc.

5. **τοῦ θεοῦ.** Dionysos had an oracle among the Bessi of Delphic lucidity, cp. 7. 111. The *παιὰν* might rather suggest Apollo: but see *infra*.

9. **ἐνθαῦτα.** It looks as if a friendly and athletic contest had resulted in a free fight: such things happen. If so, the incident has been exaggerated. But cp. note *infra* on *ὀλίγους*.

11. **ἵππον . . κύνα.** Paionian horses and hounds were celebrated. Pollux, 5. 46, Mimnermos, Fr. 17 (Stein).

12. **ἐπαιώνιζον.** The Perinthians were not mocking the Paionians but shouting the Apolline cry of victory: the clients of Dionysos apparently did not like it.

ἐπιχειρέουσι οἱ Παίονες, καὶ πολλόν τε ἐκράτησαν καὶ ἔλιπόν
2 σφεων ὀλίγους. τὰ μὲν δὴ ἀπὸ Παιόνων πρότερον γενόμενα ὧδε ἐγένετο· τότε δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίης γινομένων τῶν Περινθίων οἱ Πέρσαι τε καὶ ὁ Μεγάβαζος ἐπεκράτησαν πλήθεϊ. ὡς δὲ ἐχειρώθη ἡ Πέρινθος, ἤλαυνε Μεγάβαζος τὸν στρατὸν διὰ τῆς Θρηίκης, πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ πᾶν ἔθνος τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων ἡμερούμενος βασιλέι. ταῦτα γάρ οἱ ἐνετέταλτο ἐκ Δαρείου, Θρηίκην καταστρέφεσθαι.

3 Θρηίκων δὲ ἔθνος μέγιστόν ἐστι μετά γε Ἰνδοὺς πάντων ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ ὑπ' ἑνὸς ἄρχοιτο ἢ φρονέοι κατὰ τὠυτό, ἄμαχόν τ' ἂν εἴη καὶ πολλῷ κράτιστον πάντων ἐθνέων κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμήν. ἀλλὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἄπορόν σφι καὶ ἀμήχανον μή κοτε ἐγγένηται, εἰσὶ δὴ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀσθενέες. οὐνόματα δ' ἔχουσι πολλὰ κατὰ χώρας ἕκαστοι, νόμοισι δὲ οὗτοι παραπλησίοισι

---

17. **ὀλίγους.** Yet the Perinthians offer a stout resistance to the Persian. Rawlinson makes *πρότερον long* before, vol. iii. p. 211. If this massacre of 'Perinthians' took place before the days of the Greek colonisation it may have facilitated the Greek occupation. Unfortunately Hdt. does not precisely date the event. Perinthos may have been occupied by Samians about B.C. 599. Cp. Smith's *Dict. Geogr. sub voc.*, Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 470. The Samian connexion may perhaps explain the introduction of the tradition. The distinction between the original Perinthians and the Samian *ἔποικοι* has been obliterated.

2. 4. **πλήθεϊ**, 80,000 strong, 4. 143.

ὡς δὲ corresponds to *πρώτους μὲν* c. 1 *supra*.

5. **πόλιν**, Hellenic. **ἔθνος**, non-Hellenic.

τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων. Cp. 6. 33.

How Miltiades and the Chersonesos could be excepted from this general statement does not appear, save on the supposition that their loyalty was *sans reproche*. Cp. c. 10 *ad fin.* where the concluding sentence resumes the narrative.

3. 1. **μέγιστον.** One misses the qualification *τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*. Cp. Introduction, p. civ. The area of Thrace was much enlarged for Hdt. by his misconception of the course of the Danube. Cp. 4. 99. Even so, it is difficult to understand his putting the Thracians before the Scythians.

Ἰνδούς. Cp. 3. 94, 98.

2. **ὑπ' ἑνός**, monarchy.

φρονέοι κ.τ., like good republicans (federation).

Monarchy in Hdt.'s opinion might be a good thing—for Thracians. Sitalkes made the attempt in Hdt.'s own day to found a united Thrace, and it was repeated by Byrebistas long after. Cp. 4. 80. Was this passage written before that excursus on Sitalkes?

3. **γνώμην τὴν ἐμήν.** But not in the opinion of Thucydides, who perhaps knew more about the Thracians and less about the Scythians than Hdt. It is, indeed, difficult to avoid the inference that Thucydides had the statement of Hdt. in view when he wrote: *ταύτῃ δὲ ἀδύνατα ἐξισοῦσθαι οὐχ ὅτι τὰ ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ἔθνος ἓν πρὸς ἓν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι δυνατὸν Σκύθαις ὁμογνωμονοῦσι πᾶσιν ἀντιστῆναι*, 2. 97, 6. Asia covers the Indians of Hdt. Aristotle leaves no obscurity about the implicit moral when discussing the characteristics of a free and imperial race: *Pol.* 4. 7, 3, 1327[b] *τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων γένος . . δυνάμενον ἄρχειν πάντων, μιᾶς τυγχάνον πολιτείας*.

4. **ἄπορον.** Cp. 4. 46 *supra*.

5. **οὐνόματα . . πολλά.** We know the names of 50 tribes (R.). Hdt. names 19 (*vide* Stein *ad l.*).

The customs of the Thracians in general are specified c. 6 *infra*.

The customs of the Getae have been described 4. 93 *supra*, and are therefore here omitted.

Those of the Trausi are given c. 4, and those of 'the Thracians beyond Kreston,' c. 5 *infra*.

πάντες χρέωνται κατὰ πάντα, πλὴν Γετέων καὶ Τραυσῶν καὶ τῶν κατύπερθε Κρηστωναίων οἰκεόντων. τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν Γέται οἱ 4 ἀθανατίζοντες ποιεῦσι, εἴρηταί μοι· Τραυσοὶ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα κατὰ ταὐτὰ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Θρήιξι ἐπιτελέουσι, κατὰ δὲ τὸν γινόμενόν σφι καὶ ἀπογινόμενον ποιεῦσι τοιάδε· τὸν μὲν γενόμενον περιιζόμενοι οἱ προσήκοντες ὀλοφύρονται, ὅσα μιν δεῖ ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἀναπλῆσαι κακά, ἀνηγεόμενοι τὰ ἀνθρωπήια πάντα πάθεα· τὸν δ' ἀπογενόμενον παίζοντές τε καὶ ἡδόμενοι γῇ κρύπτουσι, ἐπιλέγοντες ὅσων κακῶν ἐξαπαλλαχθεὶς ἔστι ἐν πάσῃ εὐδαιμονίῃ. οἱ δὲ κατύπερθε Κρηστωναίων ποιεῦσι τοιάδε. ἔχει 5 γυναῖκας ἕκαστος πολλάς· ἐπεὰν ὦν τις αὐτῶν ἀποθάνῃ, κρίσις

On Thrace and the Thracians see Kiepert, *Manual*, §§ 180 ff., Smith, *Dict. Geogr.* ii. 1176 ff., Giseke, *Thrakisch-pelasgische Stämme der Balkanhalbinsel*, Leipzig, 1858. For Greeks, especially Athenians, of the Periklean age, the interest in Thrace and its inhabitants was doubtless augmented by the fresh settlements there (cp. 9. 75); and mythical or prehistoric links were revived or established (especially in Athenian speculations), cp. Gaertringen, *de Graecorum fabulis ad Thraces pertinentibus* (Berlin, 1886).

4. 2. **εἴρηται.** 4. 93 *supra*.

4. **γινόμενον . . γενόμενον.** The change of tense should be observed.

5. **ὀλοφύρονται.** This Trausic view of life as 'not worth living' is by no means uncommon, specially where a higher culture intrudes. Wholesale cases of voluntary extinction by barbarous nations are not unknown: O. Peschel, *The Races of Man*, E.T. p. 151. The pessimistic vein is, however, anything but un-Hellenic, cp. 1. 32, 7. 46. The Sophoklean chorus gives utterance to a similar sentiment *O.C.* 1225 ff.

> μὴ φῦναι τὸν ἅπαντα νι-
> κᾷ λόγον· τὸ δ', ἐπεὶ φανῇ,
> βῆναι κεῖθεν ὅθεν περ ἥκει
> πολὺ δεύτερον ὡς τάχιστα.

An incomplete list of life's evils follows: φθόνος, στάσεις, ἔρις, μάχαι, φόνοι, γῆρας. The more humane and optimistic view, which estimates life as a whole, striking a balance twixt good and ill, is embodied in such maxims and anecdotes as those reported of Solon and the Sages, cp. 1. 30, and nearly represents the cheerful common sense of the Hellenes from Achilles (*Od.* 11. 488) to Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* i. 9, 15, 1099ᵇ εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ πολύκοινον, sc. ἡ εὐδαιμονία).

The old Persians also took a cheerful view of birthdays, 1. 133. (Not so Omar Khayyám, cp. Fitzgerald's translation (?).) On the other hand, few beliefs are so primitive and general as the faith in a better life beyond the grave. See O. Peschel, *The Races of Man*, E.T. p. 258, H. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, Pt. i. cc. xiv. xv., E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, cc. xii. xiii., and specially W. R. Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (New York, 1871) (2nd Ed., Philadelphia, 1883).

Blakesley note [11] remarks that Euripides (in his *Kresphontes*) had a parallel to this custom of the Trausi, and thinks the poet heard of it "at the Macedonian court." Stein suggests that Euripides got the idea from this passage in Hdt.

9. **Κρηστωναίων.** By 'Krestonaeans' must be understood the inhabitants of Κρηστονικὴ which was a district adjoining Παιονικὴ 7. 124 (cp. 8. 116) between the Axios and the Strymon. What the relation if any between the Κρηστονικὴ γῆ (8. 116) and the Κρηστὼν πόλις (1. 57), between Κρηστωναῖοι and Κρηστωνιῆται, are moot points. To change Kreston into Kroton (=Etrurian Cortona) in 1. 57 (with Stein) cuts the knot, in a way not convincing. Perhaps Hdt.'s information is here drawn from sources that avoided ascribing city organisation to the Thracians, or Pelasgi, of Krestonike, cp. πόλις—ἔθνος c. 2 *supra*. Hdt. however below c. 7 uses πολιῆται carelessly of Thracians.

5. 2. **πολλάς.** One is tempted to think from this that the Krestonaeans at least were monogamous.

γίνεται μεγάλη τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ φίλων σπουδαὶ ἰσχυραὶ περὶ τοῦδε, ἥτις αὐτέων ἐφιλέετο μάλιστα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός· ἣ δ' ἂν κριθῇ καὶ τιμηθῇ, ἐγκωμιασθεῖσα ὑπό τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν σφάζεται ἐς τὸν τάφον ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκηιοτάτου ἑωυτῆς, σφαχθεῖσα δὲ συνθάπτεται τῷ ἀνδρί. αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι συμφορὴν μεγάλην ποιεῦνται· ὄνειδος γάρ σφι τοῦτο μέγιστον γίνεται.

6 Τῶν δὲ δὴ ἄλλων Θρηίκων ἐστὶ ὅδε νόμος. πωλεῦσι τὰ τέκνα ἐπ' ἐξαγωγῇ, τὰς δὲ παρθένους οὐ φυλάσσουσι, ἀλλ' ἐῶσι τοῖσι αὐταὶ βούλονται ἀνδράσι μίσγεσθαι· τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας ἰσχυρῶς φυλάσσουσι καὶ ὠνέονται [τὰς γυναῖκας] παρὰ τῶν γονέων χρημάτων μεγάλων. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐστίχθαι εὐγενὲς κέκριται, τὸ δὲ ἄστικτον ἀγεννές. ἀργὸν εἶναι κάλλιστον, γῆς δὲ ἐργάτην ἀτι-
7 μότατον· τὸ ζῆν ἀπὸ πολέμου καὶ ληιστύος κάλλιστον. οὗτοι μέν σφεων οἱ ἐπιφανέστατοι νόμοι εἰσί, θεοὺς δὲ σέβονται μούνους τούσδε, Ἄρεα καὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἄρτεμιν. οἱ δὲ βασιλέες αὐτῶν, πάρεξ τῶν ἄλλων πολιητέων, σέβονται Ἑρμέην μάλιστα θεῶν, καὶ ὀμνύουσι μοῦνον τοῦτον, καὶ λέγουσι γεγονέναι ἀπὸ

---

6. **σφάζεται.** This sacrifice of the favourite wife is as good a proof of belief in a future life as the practice of the Getae 4. 94, or Scyths, 4. 71. Cp. O. Peschel, *Races of Man*, p. 259. On the wide prevalence of suttee, cp. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, p. 125. The practices of polygamy and suttee would show that these highlanders had male-descent.

6. 1. **νόμος.** This and the two following chapters exhibit the use of three of the standing anthropological categories of Hdt.—*νόμοι, θεοί, ταφαί.*

2. **τὰς δὲ π.** "A great many races of mankind are quite indifferent to juvenile unchastity, and only impose strict conduct on their women after marriage" (O. Peschel, *op. c.* p. 220). But cp. Westermarck, *op. c.* 61 ff. One advantage of the *ἰσχυρὰ φυλακὴ* would be that paternity and male kinship might be ascertained and peradventure prevailed among the Thracians. On marriage by co-emption see O. Peschel, *op. c.* pp. 227 ff. Stein appropriately quotes Xen. *Anab.* 7. 2, 38 where the Thracian chief Seuthes says: *σοὶ δὲ ὦ Ξενοφῶν καὶ θυγατέρα δώσω καὶ εἴ τις σοί ἐστι θυγάτηρ ὠνήσομαι Θρᾳκίῳ νόμῳ.*

4. **τὰς γυναῖκας** *secl.* St.

5. **εὐγενές.** Tattooing was of course an abomination to the Hellene (cp. 7. 233). The barbarian view of the indignity of labour was, however, largely shared by the Greek, who made some exception in favour of agriculture. Cp. 2. 167, L. Schmidt, *Ethik d. alt. Griechen*, ii. 435 ff.

7. 2. **θεούς.** Hdt.'s list of Thracian deities is incomplete (*vide* Rawlinson) and even misleading. R.'s view that Ares, Dionysos, and Artemis represent respectively War, Drinking, and the Chase is fanciful. All three deities were more probably war-gods, hellenised by the Greeks in Thrace. Artemis may stand for the Thracian Kotys or Kotytto or for Bendis whose cult was not unknown in Athens itself (Xen. *Hell.* 2. 4, 11, Plato, *Rep.* 1. 1). Stein happily refers to 4. 33. Dionysos had an oracle among the Bessi, 7. 111.

In the royal Hermes Rawlinson sees "some mythic inventor of the useful arts." But as the Thracians despised these labours this conjecture appears unfortunate. Perhaps Hermes stands for a deity invoked by the chieftains in their bargains or treaties (*ὀμνύουσι μοῦνον τοῦτον*) with the Greeks, and represented by them (*λέγουσι*) as their ancestor. That ancestor-worship was practised is of course not disputed.

4. **πολιητέων** looks like a *lapsus calami*, but cp. cc. 5 *supra*, 15 *infra*.

Ἑρμέω ἑωυτούς. ταφαὶ δὲ τοῖσι εὐδαίμοσι αὐτῶν εἰσὶ αἵδε· 8
τρεῖς μὲν ἡμέρας προτιθεῖσι τὸν νεκρόν, καὶ παντοῖα σφάξαντες ἱρήια εὐωχέονται προκλαύσαντες πρῶτον· ἔπειτα δὲ θάπτουσι κατακαύσαντες ἢ ἄλλως γῇ κρύψαντες, χῶμα δὲ χέαντες ἀγῶνα τιθεῖσι παντοῖον, ἐν τῷ τὰ μέγιστα ἄεθλα τίθεται κατὰ λόγον μουνομαχίης. ταφαὶ μὲν δὴ Θρηίκων εἰσὶ αἵδε.

Τὸ δὲ πρὸς βορέω τῆς χώρης ἔτι ταύτης οὐδεὶς ἔχει φράσαι τὸ 9
ἀτρεκὲς οἵτινές εἰσι ἄνθρωποι οἰκέοντες [αὐτήν], ἀλλὰ [τὰ πέρην ἤδη τοῦ Ἴστρου] ἔρημος χώρη φαίνεται ἐοῦσα καὶ ἄπειρος. μούνους δὲ δύναμαι πυθέσθαι οἰκέοντας πέρην τοῦ Ἴστρου ἀνθρώπους τοῖσι οὔνομα εἶναι Σιγύννας, ἐσθῆτι δὲ χρεωμένους Μηδικῇ· τοὺς δὲ ἵππους αὐτῶν εἶναι λασίους ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα ἐπὶ πέντε δακτύλους τὸ βάθος τῶν τριχῶν, μικροὺς δὲ καὶ σιμοὺς καὶ ἀδυνάτους ἄνδρας φέρειν, ζευγνυμένους δὲ ὑπ᾽ ἅρματα εἶναι ὀξυτάτους· ἁρματηλατέειν δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους. κατήκειν δὲ

---

8. 1. τοῖσι εὐδαίμοσι. The wealthy, cp. cc. 28, 31 *infra*.

3. **ἔπειτα . . κρύψαντες**, tr. 'they burn and bury the corpse, or simply bury it.'

5. **τὰ μέγιστα ἄεθλα τίθεται κατὰ λόγον μουνομαχίης**, "the single combat is awarded the highest prize" (R.); "in the way of single combat" (Bl.); "die grössten Preise für den Einzelkampf je nach seiner Bedeutung ausgesetzt werden" (St.); "die grössten Preise ausgesetzt werden, je nach Verhältniss des Zweikampfes" (Baehr). The meaning seems to be simply: 'The greatest prizes (given for such things) are awarded, the competitors being matched in pairs.' There is no necessary implication that smaller prizes were awarded on a different system: or that the importance of the various 'duels' varied. The contrast implied lies not between the several items in the Thracian ἀγών, but between the Thracian ἀγών and Hellenic ἀγῶνες in which the prizes were slight (ὁ διδόμενος στέφανος 8. 26), and more than two competitors entered (c. 22 *infra*). An example of this Thracian μουνομαχίη is given c. 1 *supra*.

9. 1. οὐδείς. Cp. the formulae in 4. 16, 24. Who furnished him with τὸ ἀτρεκὲς concerning Thrace itself Hdt. unfortunately does not specify. This chapter may have been derived in part from western Greek sources. It carries us into the Adriatic region. See Introduction, p. xcix. and l. 5 *infra*.

2. **αὐτήν· τὰ . . Ἴστρου** *secl.* Stein.

3. **ἄπειρος.** There is no Ocean on the north of Europe, according to Hdt. Cp. 4. 36, 45.

4. **πέρην τ. Ἴ.** The Danube with Hdt. is the N. boundary of Thrace, and as he probably places the Danube in this part much too far north, he has the more room for Thrace. Cp. c. 3 *supra*.

5. **Σιγύννας.** Steph. Byz. quotes Ktesias as authority for Σίγυνοι in Egypt. Strabo 520 places Σίγυννοι in the Caspian region, and says of them τἆλλα μὲν περσίζουσιν, ἱππαρίοις δὲ χρῶνται μικροῖς δασέσιν κτλ. The resemblance with this passage is obvious. In the 'Zigeuner' (gipsies) Bl. sees a survival of the Sigynnae. Touching their Medic origin there may have been some confusion on the part of Hdt. or his sources over the Thracian tribe Μαιδοί (Steph. Byz. *sub v.*), whom he does not mention. The 'Median' dress (c. 49 *infra*, cp. 6. 112) may have supported the theory. But cp. Strabo *l. c. supra*.

The Eneti on the Adrias (cp. Hekataios *apud* Steph. Byz. *sub voc.* Ἀδρία) are probably so described to distinguish them from the Paphlagonian Ἐνετοί of the *Iliad* 2. 852. Blakesley suggests that the Eneti conducted a traffic between the Adriatic and the Euxine by means of some entrepôt on the Danube. Cp. 4. 33. We have here again an indication of the Amber route from the Baltic, all the more valuable if this passage be from a different source.

6. **ἵππους.** Bl. sees in these small horses *polnische Pferde*, *i.e.* ponies.

τούτων τοὺς οὔρους ἀγχοῦ Ἐνετῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίῃ. εἶναι δὲ Μήδων σφέας ἀποίκους λέγουσι. ὅκως δὲ οὗτοι Μήδων ἄποικοι γεγόνασι, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω ἐπιφράσασθαι, γένοιτο δ' ἂν πᾶν ἐν τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ. σιγύννας δ' ὦν καλέουσι Λίγυες οἱ ἄνω ὑπὲρ
10 Μασσαλίης οἰκέοντες τοὺς καπήλους, Κύπριοι δὲ τὰ δόρατα. ὡς δὲ Θρήικες λέγουσι, μέλισσαι κατέχουσι τὰ πέρην τοῦ Ἴστρου, καὶ ὑπὸ τουτέων οὐκ εἶναι διελθεῖν τὸ προσωτέρω. ἐμοὶ μέν νυν ταῦτα λέγοντες δοκέουσι λέγειν οὐκ οἰκότα· τὰ γὰρ ζῷα ταῦτα φαίνεται εἶναι δύσριγα· ἀλλά μοι τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν ἄρκτον ἀοίκητα δοκέει εἶναι διὰ τὰ ψύχεα. ταῦτα μέν νυν τῆς χώρης ταύτης πέρι λέγεται· τὰ παραθαλάσσια δ' ὦν αὐτῆς Μεγάβαζος Περσέων κατήκοα ἐποίεε.

11 Δαρεῖος δὲ ὡς διαβὰς τάχιστα τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἀπίκετο ἐς Σάρδις, ἐμνήσθη τῆς ἐξ Ἱστιαίου τε τοῦ Μιλησίου εὐεργεσίης καὶ τῆς παραινέσιος τοῦ Μυτιληναίου Κώεω, μεταπεμψάμενος δέ σφεας ἐς Σάρδις ἐδίδου αὐτοῖσι αἵρεσιν. ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἱστιαῖος, ἅτε τυραννεύων τῆς Μιλήτου, τυραννίδος μὲν οὐδεμιῆς προσεχρήιζε, αἰτέει δὲ Μύρκινον τὴν Ἠδωνῶν, βουλόμενος ἐν αὐτῇ πόλιν κτίσαι. οὗτος μὲν δὴ ταύτην αἱρέεται, ὁ δὲ Κώης, οἷά τε οὐ
12 τύραννος δημότης τε ἐών, αἰτέει Μυτιλήνης τυραννεῦσαι. τελεω-

---

10. **Ἀδρίῃ.** The river probably, not the sea. Cp. 1. 163, Steph. B. *l. c. supra.* Arnold in Thuc. 1. 24 takes it of "the country." His note is worth consulting.

12. **γένοιτο δ' ἂν πᾶν.** Cp. Sophokles, *Aias*, 646; 4. 195 *supra*, Introduction, § 22.

13. **σιγύννας . . δόρατα.** The last sentence of this chapter is suspiciously like a gloss. Stein defends it. If genuine it is all the more remarkable as the only passage where Hdt. names the greatest of the Phokaian colonies. It is inconceivable, however, that Hdt. should have been ignorant of the existence of Massalia. This passage would also bear out the view that Hdt.'s information here is derived from a western source. It is plainly not from a 'Thracian': see next chapter. Cp. Introduction, p. xcix.

10. 2. **Θρήικες.** He returns to eastern sources. The specification of the source here accompanies incredulity, cp. 4. 187. Hdt. might have rationalised the Thracian bees into the sting of cold, as the Scythic feathers into snowflakes 4. 31 *supra*, but stops short of that. Is it possible that the 'bees' were gnats or mosquitoes?

5. **τὴν ἄρκτον.** The Bear (cp. 4. 191). Ἄρκτον θ' ἣν καὶ Ἅμαξαν ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσι *Il.* 18. 487. The constellation *Ursa Major*. The translation "pole" (Macaulay) seems to imply a cosmical theory, of which Hdt. betrays no conception. Cp. 4. 36.

7. **τὰ παραθαλάσσια.** The Thracian Chersonese would have to be included, if the loyalty of Miltiades were not above suspicion. Cp. c. 2 *supra*.

11. 1. **διαβάς.** Which he could hardly have done without the support of Miltiades.

Ἑλλήσποντον in narrower sense. Cp. 4. 38. The sentence carries back to 4. 143. The service of Histiaios 4. 137-142, the suggestion of Koes, 4. 97. In their rewards the tyrannis here appears as the out-post and prop of 'Medism.' Cp. 4. 137.

Myrkinos was not on the site afterwards occupied by Amphipolis (Nine Ways, 8. 114) *vid.* Rawlinson *ad l.* The Edonians recovered the city c. 126 *infra*, and it was in their hands in 424 B.C. Thuc. 4. 107 (St.).

θέντων δὲ ἀμφοτέροισι, οὗτοι μὲν κατὰ τὰ εἵλοντο ἐτράποντο, Δαρεῖον δὲ συνήνεικε πρῆγμα τοιόνδε ἰδόμενον ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἐντείλασθαι Μεγαβάζῳ Παίονας ἑλόντα ἀνασπάστους ποιῆσαι ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης. ἦν Πίγρης καὶ Μαντύης ἄνδρες Παίονες, οἳ ἐπείτε Δαρεῖος διέβη ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, αὐτοὶ ἐθέλοντες Παιόνων τυραννεύειν ἀπικνέονται ἐς Σάρδις, ἅμα ἀγόμενοι ἀδελφεὴν μεγάλην τε καὶ εὐειδέα. φυλάξαντες δὲ Δαρεῖον προκατιζόμενον ἐς τὸ προάστειον τὸ τῶν Λυδῶν ἐποίησαν τοιόνδε· σκευάσαντες τὴν ἀδελφεὴν ὡς εἶχον ἄριστα, ἐπ᾽ ὕδωρ ἔπεμπον ἄγγος ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἔχουσαν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βραχίονος ἵππον ἐπέλκουσαν καὶ κλώθουσαν λίνον. ὡς δὲ παρεξήιε ἡ γυνή, ἐπιμελὲς τῷ Δαρείῳ ἐγένετο· οὔτε γὰρ Περσικὰ ἦν οὔτε Λύδια τὰ ποιεύμενα ἐκ τῆς γυναικός, οὔτε πρὸς τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίης οὐδαμῶν. ἐπιμελὲς δὲ ὥς οἱ ἐγένετο, τῶν δορυφόρων τινὰς πέμπει κελεύων φυλάξαι ὅ τι χρήσεται τῷ ἵππῳ ἡ γυνή. οἱ μὲν δὴ ὄπισθε εἵποντο· ἡ δὲ ἐπείτε ἀπίκετο ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν, ἦρσε τὸν ἵππον, ἄρσασα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄγγος τοῦ ὕδατος ἐμπλησαμένη τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν παρεξήιε, φέρουσα τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ ἐπέλκουσα ἐκ τοῦ βραχίονος
τὸν ἵππον καὶ στρέφουσα τὸν ἄτρακτον. θωμάζων δὲ ὁ Δαρεῖος 13
τά τε ἤκουσε ἐκ τῶν κατασκόπων καὶ τὰ αὐτὸς ὥρα, ἄγειν αὐτὴν ἐκέλευε ἑωυτῷ ἐς ὄψιν. ὡς δὲ ἄχθη, παρῆσαν καὶ οἱ ἀδελφεοὶ αὐτῆς οὔ κῃ πρόσω σκοπιὴν ἔχοντες τούτων. εἰρωτῶντος δὲ τοῦ Δαρείου ὁποδαπὴ εἴη, ἔφασαν οἱ νεηνίσκοι εἶναι Παίονες καὶ ἐκείνην εἶναι σφέων ἀδελφεήν. ὁ δ᾽ ἀμείβετο, τίνες δὲ οἱ Παίονες ἄνθρωποί εἰσι καὶ κοῦ γῆς οἰκημένοι, καὶ τί κεῖνοι ἐθέλοντες

---

12. 3. Δαρεῖον συνήνεικε . . ἐπιθυμῆσαι. The words suggest a coincidence rather than a causal relation. Cp. *ἐπεθύμησε* 4. 1. *ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἐντείλασθαι ποιῆσαι* is an inelegant sequence. The charming story which follows, cc. 12, 13, seems hardly adequate to account for the fate of the Paionians.

The passage suggests a picture; like some other passages in Hdt.'s work: cp. 4. 88. Had the subject been pictorially treated? Nicolas of Damascus (*apud* Constantin. Porph. *de them.* 1. 3, *Hist. Gr. min.* i. p. 73 ed. Teub., Müller, *Frag. Hist.* iii. p. 413) tells the same story, with trifling variations, of a certain 'Thracian' (Mysian) and his wife, Alyattes the Lydian king taking the place of Dareios. Though the citation is bald, it is quite as likely to give the earlier version. "The repetition of such tales is a common feature of ancient legendary history" (R.). For another instance cp. c. 20 *infra*. A local story has apparently been transferred to Dareios. Possibly the *τοιόνδε* betrays a slight misgiving on the part of Hdt.: or a hint that he has touched up the material. Cp. Appendix IV. § 7.

14. **Ἀσίης.** In Asia the women were kept in confinement. This contrast may have contributed to the elaboration of the anecdote. The political motive suggested (*ἐθέλοντες Παιόνων τυραννεύειν*) for the ruse of the brothers, and the nemesis which attends them, are also observable, in the same connexion.

13. 6. τίνες . . ἄνθρωποί εἰσι καὶ κοῦ γῆς οἰκημένοι. Cp. the question of Kyros respecting the Lakedaimonians 1. 153, and of Dareios respecting the Athenians c. 105 *infra*. Even satraps put this lordly question, c. 73 *infra*.

ἔλθοιεν ἐς Σάρδις. οἱ δέ οἱ ἔφραζον ὡς ἔλθοιεν μὲν ἐκείνῳ
δώσοντες σφέας αὐτούς, εἴη δὲ ἡ Παιονίη ἐπὶ τῷ Στρυμόνι
ποταμῷ πεπολισμένη, ὁ δὲ Στρυμὼν οὐ πρόσω τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου,
εἴησαν δὲ Τευκρῶν τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἄποικοι. οἱ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα
ἕκαστα ἔλεγον, ὁ δὲ εἰρώτα εἰ καὶ πᾶσαι αὐτόθι αἱ γυναῖκες
εἴησαν οὕτω ἐργάτιδες. οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἔφασαν προθύμως οὕτω
14 ἔχειν· αὐτοῦ γὰρ ὦν τούτου εἵνεκα καὶ ἐποιέετο. ἐνθαῦτα
Δαρεῖος γράφει γράμματα Μεγαβάζῳ, τὸν ἔλιπε ἐν τῇ Θρηίκῃ
στρατηγόν, ἐντελλόμενος ἐξαναστῆσαι ἐξ ἠθέων Παίονας καὶ παρ'
ἑωυτὸν ἀγαγεῖν καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ τέκνα τε καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας
αὐτῶν. αὐτίκα δὲ ἱππεὺς ἔθεε φέρων τὴν ἀγγελίην ἐπὶ τὸν
Ἑλλήσποντον, περαιωθεὶς δὲ διδοῖ τὸ βυβλίον τῷ Μεγαβάζῳ. ὁ
δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος καὶ λαβὼν ἡγεμόνας ἐκ τῆς Θρηίκης ἐστρατεύετο
15 ἐπὶ τὴν Παιονίην. πυθόμενοι δὲ οἱ Παίονες τοὺς Πέρσας ἐπὶ
σφέας ἰέναι, ἁλισθέντες ἐξεστρατεύσαντο πρὸς θαλάσσης, δοκέοντες
ταύτῃ ἐπιχειρήσειν τοὺς Πέρσας ἐμβάλλοντας. οἱ μὲν δὴ Παίονες
ἦσαν ἕτοιμοι τὸν Μεγαβάζου στρατὸν ἐπιόντα ἐρύκειν· οἱ δὲ
Πέρσαι πυθόμενοι συναλίσθαι τοὺς Παίονας καὶ τὴν πρὸς
θαλάσσης ἐσβολὴν φυλάσσοντας, ἔχοντες ἡγεμόνας τὴν ἄνω
ὁδὸν τράπονται, λαθόντες δὲ τοὺς Παίονας ἐσπίπτουσι ἐς τὰς

---

9. **Παιονίη . . πεπολισμένη.** An exaggeration no doubt. Cp. *πολιητέων* c. 7 *supra*.

11. **Τευκρῶν.** This would be an argument for the Persian protectorate, as the Persians claimed Asiatics in their own right. Cp. 1. 4. On Teukrian colonies cp. 4. 191. That Troians might have found their way to Thrace, after the destruction of their city, is surely not very improbable. Rawlinson erroneously supposes that the Paionians are here conceived as an off-shoot of the Teukri, before these left their ancient abode in Europe. R.'s supposition is disproved by 7. 20 which he here quotes in support of his mistake. The Strymon was claimed centuries after as the western frontier of the Persian empire. Cp. letter of Sapor to Constantius A.D. 358. "As the lawful successor of Darius Hystaspis Sapor asserted that the river Strymon in Macedonia was the true and ancient boundary of his empire," Gibbon, c. xix. (ii. 405, ed. 1848).

13. **ἐργάτιδες·** *ἐργοπόνους ἐργώδεις τε καὶ χειρώνακτας*, Nic. Dam. *l.c. supra*.

ἔφασαν προθύμως. The young men overreach themselves, and instead of winning crowns involve their own people in captivity. *αὐτοῦ τούτου εἵνεκα* is vague, if not inconsequential. The object of the young men has been expressly stated above, to establish a tyranny in Paionia, supported by the Persians: their action was, however, better calculated to produce the result actually realised. This inconsequence is not involved in the story, as found in Nicolas, and is another reason for condemning the Herodotean version: not but what consistency may be a product of reflection. Such inconsequences, however, are not rare in Herodotus, and betray his constructive methods. Cp. Introduction, § 19.

14. 2. **γράφει γράμματα.** One cannot suppose that Hdt. had documentary evidence for this special commission, which here comes in to define the more general direction *Θρηίκην καταστρέφεσθαι* c. 2 *supra*. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxvii.

5. **ἱππεύς.** The Persian courier service, or royal post, is more fully described 8. 98. But on the present occasion a single messenger seems to have performed the whole service.

15. 6. **τὴν ἄνω ὁδὸν τράπονται** antici-

πόλιας αὐτῶν ἐούσας ἀνδρῶν ἐρήμους· οἷα δὲ κεινῇσι ἐπιπεσόντες εὐπετέως κατέσχον. οἱ δὲ Παίονες ὡς ἐπύθοντο ἐχομένας τὰς πόλιας, αὐτίκα διασκεδασθέντες κατ᾽ ἑωυτοὺς ἕκαστοι ἐτράποντο καὶ παρεδίδοσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι. οὕτω δὴ Παιόνων Σιριοπαίονές τε καὶ Παιόπλαι καὶ οἱ μέχρι τῆς Πρασιάδος
λίμνης ἐξ ἠθέων ἐξαναστάντες ἤγοντο ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην. οἱ δὲ περί 16
τε Πάγγαιον ὄρος [καὶ Δόβηρας καὶ Ἀγριᾶνας καὶ Ὀδομάντους] καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν λίμνην τὴν Πρασιάδα οὐκ ἐχειρώθησαν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Μεγαβάζου· ἐπειρήθη δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ κατοικημένους ἐξαιρέειν ὧδε. ἴκρια ἐπὶ σταυρῶν ὑψηλῶν ἐζευγμένα ἐν μέσῃ ἕστηκε τῇ λίμνῃ, ἔσοδον ἐκ τῆς ἠπείρου στεινὴν ἔχοντα μιῇ γεφύρῃ. τοὺς δὲ σταυροὺς τοὺς ὑπεστεῶτας τοῖσι ἰκρίοισι τὸ μέν κου ἀρχαῖον ἔστησαν κοινῇ πάντες οἱ πολιῆται, μετὰ δὲ νόμῳ χρεώμενοι ἱστᾶσι τοιῷδε· κομίζοντες ἐξ ὄρεος τῷ οὔνομά ἐστι Ὄρβηλος, κατὰ γυναῖκα ἑκάστην ὁ γαμέων τρεῖς σταυροὺς ὑπίστησι· ἄγεται δὲ ἕκαστος συχνὰς γυναῖκας. οἰκέουσι δὲ τοιοῦτον τρόπον, κρατέων ἕκαστος ἐπὶ τῶν ἰκρίων καλύβης τε ἐν τῇ διαιτᾶται καὶ θύρης καταπακτῆς διὰ τῶν ἰκρίων κάτω φερούσης ἐς τὴν λίμνην. τὰ δὲ νήπια παιδία δέουσι τοῦ ποδὸς σπάρτῳ, μὴ κατακυλισθῇ δειμαίνοντες. τοῖσι δὲ ἵπποισι καὶ τοῖσι ὑποζυγίοισι παρέχουσι χόρτον ἰχθῦς· τῶν δὲ πλῆθός ἐστι τοσοῦτο ὥστε, ὅταν τὴν θύρην τὴν καταπακτὴν ἀνακλίνῃ, κατιεῖ σχοίνῳ σπυρίδα κεινὴν ἐς τὴν λίμνην, καὶ οὐ πολλόν τινα χρόνον ἐπισχὼν

---

pates the strategy at Thermopylae 7. 213. This same pass was afterwards traversed by Brutus and Cassius on the way to Philippi. The normal pass followed the valley of the Strymon. Giseke, *Thrakisch-pelasgische Stämme*, p. 5.

8. **πόλιας**, used loosely for κῶμαι, cp. πεπολισμένη, c. 13 *supra*. If they had been really empty (κεινῇσι) the men need hardly have surrendered.

12. **Σιριοπαίονες.** Giseke (*op. cit.* p. 4) sees their name in the town Siris (mod. Seres) 8. 115. A town in Italy bore the same name, cp. 8. 62 and Steph. B. *sub voc.*

Παιόπλαι. Giseke places east of the Siriopaionians.

μέχρι. As far (north) as . . .

16. 2. **Πάγγαιον ὄρος.** The district abounded with gold and silver 7. 112. The tribes on Mount 'Pangaion' would be in the rear of Megabazos when he had reached the Paionian plain north of the mountains. The Doberi (to be distinguished from the tribe, Thuc. 2. 99) are placed (by Giseke) "between Amphipolis and Philippi"; the Odomanti further north on left bank of the Strymon; the Agriani still further north, by the sources of the same river. "The lake Prasias is the lake into which the Strymon flows" (Giseke *op. c.*). It is difficult to believe that Paionia was conquered, or even attacked, until the tribes in the region of Pangaion and Prasias had been reduced to order. Cp. next chapter. Stein brackets the words καὶ . . Ὀδομάντους.

5. **ἐξαιρέειν ὧδε** is very harsh. St. suggests κατοικημένους δὲ ὧδε instead of ὧδε. Abicht simply transposes ἐξαιρέειν κατοικημένους.

We have in this chapter the earliest description of 'Lake Dwellings.' On the subject in general consult Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, c. vi., *Encyc. Br.* xiv.[9] 222 ff., R. Munro, *The Lake Dwellings of*

ἀνασπᾷ πλήρεα ἰχθύων. τῶν δὲ ἰχθύων ἐστὶ γένεα δύο, τοὺς καλέουσι πάπρακάς τε καὶ τίλωνας.

17 Παιόνων μὲν δὴ οἱ χειρωθέντες ἤγοντο ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην. Μεγάβαζος δὲ ὡς ἐχειρώσατο τοὺς Παίονας, πέμπει ἀγγέλους ἐς Μακε-

---

Europe (London, 1890), and the forthcoming *Album lacustre du Musée de Lausanne*. Whether there were really Lake Dwellings in Lake Prasias, or not, has not been ascertained; and it is at least possible that Hdt. may here have mixed up some description of such remains with a report of such a method of fishing as that described in Rawlinson, note *ad l.* vol. iii. p. 222.

17. 2. ὡς ἐχειρώσατο. After conquering but before carrying them into Asia. Cp. c. 23 *infra, ad init.* The conquest of Paionia was by no means complete or effective. The Paionians lay out of the direct line of advance, and it required a special command from the king to bring about operations against them, c. 14 *sup.* The direct advance of the Persians is now resumed, and brings them into contact with Macedonia, the E. frontier of which, at this date, may be placed on the Axios. The invasion of Thrace, with the reduction of the Paionians and other tribes by the Persians, was no doubt a benefit to Macedonian ambition, of which it was not slow to avail itself. Amyntas old in years and affairs sees his opportunity, and pays homage to the Persian king. The story of the patriotism and chivalry of Alexander which follows would be more credible but for the following considerations: (1) his subsequent conduct and policy were not of a piece with what is here set down. Not merely does he himself afterwards make terms with the Persian (see c. 21 *infra*), he also makes, so far as we learn, no effort subsequently to repudiate the Persian supremacy, though opportunity was not wanting, see 6. 44. (2) Similar stories, as Rawlinson remarks, are told of other persons: of Messenians and Laconians, by Pausanias 4. 4, 2. Of Athenians and Megaraeans by Polyainos 1. 20, 2 (= Plutarch, *Solon* 8). Of Theban exiles and the Polemarchs by Xenophon, *Hell.* 5. 4, 2-6. Add the banquet scene in Plutarch, *Theseus* 30, which, however, lacks the *Verkleidung*; and the story of the Minyae 4. 146 *supra*, which lacks the banquet. Of course such things may happen, and may happen more than once; yet the repetition of similar stories tends to discredit. Cp. c. 12 *supra*. If it be said that there are touches of verisimilitude in Hdt.'s story (*e.g.* ἀλγηδόνας ὀφθαλμῶν c. 18 *infra*), it may be answered that such touches are not beyond the art of the good story-teller, and that there are other touches (see c. 18 *infra*) with a contrary moral. There are, besides, many small omissions and inconsequences in the story: were interpreters employed? How many of the supposed ladies were there, seven or more? How was the massacre of the suite managed? Where is the scene laid? and so forth. (3) If the story were not so easily explained, the motive so obvious! The story is a part of the general glorification of Alexander and Macedon, which is conspicuous in every reference to him in Hdt. Cp. c. 22 *infra*.

This observation in no way impugns the *bona fides* of Herodotus, who in such matters was not hypercritical. Stein remarks on the partiality of Hdt. for the Macedonian royal house, and credits the tradition of his residence at the court. (Cp. c. 22 *infra* αὐτοὶ λέγουσι αὐτός τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος.) Apart from this possibility, it would seem that Athenian observers in the Herodotean age were interested in Macedon, with which the Athenians would fain have been on good terms, and the traditions of the Persian wars in Hdt. are largely an Athenian product. The friendship and fidelity of Alexander to Athens were such a wholesome and suggestive memory in the days of the shifty Perdikkas! Cp. Thucyd. 1. 57.

Grote (viii. 83 ed. 1872) believes the story in Xenophon, although he has this anticipation before his eyes, and although Xenophon admits that there was another account of the affair, afterwards endorsed by Plutarch, which omitted the 'young men in women's attire.' The fabulous character of the Messenian legends preserved by Pausanias make against the story told by him. It resembles the story of the Athenians told by Polyainos (cp. Plutarch, *Solon*, *l. c. supra*), and this might be the most genuine of all the traditions. Even in this case the ruse,

δονίην ἄνδρας ἑπτὰ Πέρσας, οἳ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον ἦσαν δοκι-
μώτατοι ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ· ἐπέμποντο δὲ οὗτοι παρὰ Ἀμύντην
αἰτήσοντες γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ Δαρείῳ βασιλέι. ἔστι δὲ ἐκ τῆς
Πρασιάδος λίμνης σύντομος κάρτα ἐς τὴν Μακεδονίην· πρῶτον
μὲν γὰρ ἔχεται τῆς λίμνης τὸ μέταλλον ἐξ οὗ ὕστερον τούτων
τάλαντον ἀργυρίου Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἡμέρης ἑκάστης ἐφοίτα, μετὰ δὲ
τὸ μέταλλον Δύσωρον καλεόμενον ὄρος ὑπερβάντα εἶναι ἐν Μακε-
δονίῃ. οἱ ὦν Πέρσαι οἱ πεμφθέντες οὗτοι παρὰ τὸν Ἀμύντην ὡς 18
ἀπίκοντο, αἴτεον ἐλθόντες ἐς ὄψιν τὴν Ἀμύντεω Δαρείῳ βασιλέι
γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. ὁ δὲ ταῦτά τε ἐδίδου καί σφεας ἐπὶ ξείνια
καλέει, παρασκευασάμενος δὲ δεῖπνον μεγαλοπρεπὲς ἐδέκετο τοὺς
Πέρσας φιλοφρόνως. ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου ἐγένοντο, διαπίνοντες
εἶπαν οἱ Πέρσαι τάδε. "ξεῖνε Μακεδών, ἡμῖν νόμος ἐστὶ τοῖσι

---

or the story of the ruse, might have been suggested by something in the ritual at Kolias. But if such a story was afloat at Athens, and connected with Solon, it is not difficult to see in it one source of the story of Alexander and his young men. The new element in the Atheno-Macedonian version is the Banquet. (Cp. Plutarch, *Theseus*, *l. c. supra*.) Whatever the source or origin of the story, it is hardly credible in the light of the inconsistencies, improbabilities, and duplicates above pointed out. Cp. further, Appendix IV. § 7.

3. **ἑπτά.** The number but not the names being given, a particularity which should not be used as an argument for the truth of the story. Krüger observes that Seven is the holy number of the Persians. Cp. the number of the conspirators against the Magi, 3. 70, 71, a number indubitably authentic, or at least official (Behistun). The large number of envoys, and the fact that they were all true Persians (*Πέρσας* not as in c. 1 *supra*) and of the highest rank, all go to mark the dignity of the Macedonian court. Apparently only two heralds were sent to Sparta, 7. 134 (anno 491 B.C. cp. 6. 48 *infra*).

4. **Ἀμύντην**, fifth in descent from Perdikkas the founder of the Macedonian fortunes. Cp. 8. 137. A few years, or it might be months, after this Amyntas offered Anthemus, a district near Therme at the head of the Thermaic gulf, to the exiled Hippias: c. 94 *infra*. Perhaps it was not his to give: any way Hippias declined the offer, preferring a direct application to Persia.

5. **γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ.** The symbolic offerings of subjects or vassals. Cp. 6. 48.

7. **ὕστερον.** At this time the district was not yet subject to Macedon: indeed in making Dysoros the eastern frontier of Macedonia Hdt. is guilty of an anachronism. The frontier about 510 B.C. may be left at the Axios, or at most on the east of the Thermaic gulf. Hdt. indeed makes the Axios the boundary between Mygdonia and Bottiaeis (7. 123), and the Lydias and Haliakmon the boundary between Bottiaeis and Makedonis proper (7. 127) in his own day. But these are rather political than ethnical frontiers.

8. **ἐφοίτα.** Cp. 3. 115 *ἀπ' ὅτευ τὸ ἤλεκτρον φοιτᾶν λόγος ἐστί.* In the absence of any indication of the duration of this large output, it seems useless to attempt an estimate of the annual income, gross or net; it may have ceased at the time of writing, and Alexander was presumably no more. Cp. Introduction, § 16, v; Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 193.

18. 2. **ἀπίκοντο.** Hdt. omits to state the place at which the scene is laid. Blakesley is no doubt right in specifying Aigai (Edessa), "high up in the mountains." Pella was not the Macedonian 'Residence' until the days of Philip II.

6. **νόμος.** "If this portion of the tale be true (the speakers) must have presumed greatly upon the Greek ignorance of Persian customs" (R.). (Cp. 1. 133 for Persian drinking bouts.) Stein quotes Plutarch, *Mor.* 613 *τοὺς Πέρσας ὀρθῶς φασι μὴ ταῖς γαμεταῖς ἀλλὰ ταῖς παλλακίσι συμμεθύσκεσθαι καὶ συνορχεῖσθαι.*

Πέρσῃσι, ἐπεὰν δεῖπνον προτιθώμεθα μέγα, τότε καὶ τὰς παλλακὰς καὶ τὰς κουριδίας γυναῖκας ἐσάγεσθαι παρέδρους. σύ νυν, ἐπεί περ προθύμως μὲν ἐδέξαο μεγάλως δὲ ξεινίζεις, διδοῖς δὲ βασιλέι [Δαρείῳ] γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ, ἕπεο νόμῳ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ." εἶπε πρὸς ταῦτα Ἀμύντης "ὦ Πέρσαι, νόμος μὲν ἡμῖν γέ ἐστι οὐκ οὗτος, ἀλλὰ κεχωρίσθαι ἄνδρας γυναικῶν· ἐπείτε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐόντες δεσπόται προσχρηίζετε τούτων, παρέσται ὑμῖν καὶ ταῦτα." εἴπας τοσαῦτα ὁ Ἀμύντης μετεπέμπετο τὰς γυναῖκας· αἱ δ' ἐπείτε καλεόμεναι ἦλθον, ἐπεξῆς ἀντίαι ἵζοντο τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Πέρσαι ἰδόμενοι γυναῖκας εὐμόρφους ἔλεγον πρὸς Ἀμύντην φάμενοι τὸ ποιηθὲν τοῦτο οὐδὲν εἶναι σοφόν· κρέσσον γὰρ εἶναι ἀρχῆθεν μὴ ἐλθεῖν τὰς γυναῖκας ἢ ἐλθούσας καὶ μὴ παριζομένας ἀντίας ἵζεσθαι ἀλγηδόνας σφίσι ὀφθαλμῶν. ἀναγκαζόμενος δὲ ὁ Ἀμύντης ἐκέλευε παρίζειν· πειθομενέων δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτίκα οἱ Πέρσαι μαστῶν τε ἅπτοντο οἷα πλεόνως οἰνωμένοι, καί κού τις

19 καὶ φιλέειν ἐπειρᾶτο. Ἀμύντης μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ὁρέων ἀτρέμας εἶχε, καίπερ δυσφορέων, οἷα ὑπερδειμαίνων τοὺς Πέρσας· Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ Ἀμύντεω παρεών τε καὶ ὁρέων ταῦτα, ἅτε νέος τε ἐὼν καὶ κακῶν ἀπαθής, οὐδαμῶς ἔτι κατέχειν οἷός τε ἦν, ὥστε δὲ βαρέως φέρων εἶπε πρὸς Ἀμύντην τάδε. "ὦ πάτερ, σὺ μὲν εἶκε τῇ ἡλικίῃ ἀπιών τε ἀναπαύεο, μηδὲ λιπάρεε τῇ πόσι· ἐγὼ δὲ προσμένων αὐτοῦ τῇδε πάντα τὰ ἐπιτήδεα παρέξω τοῖσι ξείνοισι." πρὸς ταῦτα συνιεὶς Ἀμύντης ὅτι νεώτερα πρήγματα πρήσσειν μέλλοι ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, λέγει "ὦ παῖ, σχεδὸν γάρ σευ ἀνακαιομένου συνίημι τοὺς λόγους, ὅτι ἐθέλεις ἐμὲ ἐκπέμψας ποιέειν τι νεώτερον· ἐγὼ ὦν σευ χρηίζω μηδὲν νεοχμῶσαι κατ' ἄνδρας τούτους, ἵνα μὴ ἐξεργάσῃ ἡμέας, ἀλλὰ ἀνέχευ ὁρέων τὰ ποιεύμενα·

20 ἀμφὶ δὲ ἀπόδῳ τῇ ἐμῇ πείσομαί τοι." ὡς δὲ ὁ Ἀμύντης χρηίσας τούτων οἰχώκεε, λέγει ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας "γυναικῶν τουτέων, ὦ ξεῖνοι, ἔστι ὑμῖν πολλὴ εὐπετείη, καὶ εἰ πάσῃσι βούλεσθε μίσγεσθαι καὶ ὁκόσῃσι ὦν αὐτέων. τούτου μὲν πέρι

---

10. **Δαρείῳ** *seclusit* Stein.

19. **ἀλγηδόνας . . ὀφθαλμῶν.** Blakesley suggests that this curious expression represents an orientalism; even if so, such touches are not beyond the story-teller's art. Alexander the Great is made to return the compliment by using the same expression of the Persian ladies, Plutarch, *Alex.* 21.

19. 3. νέος. Young and inexperienced but not devoid of shrewdness (*σοφία* c. 21 *infra*).

4. **κατέχειν.** Cp. 6. 129 *κατεῖχε ἑωυτὸν* followed by *οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος.*

7. **πάντα τὰ ἐπιτήδεα.** Not without a certain irony.

8. **νεώτερα πρήγματα πρήσσειν.** A very strong expression: *ποιέειν τι νεώτερον* and *νεοχμῶσαι* below rather milder. Cp. 4. 201.

12. **ἐξεργάσῃ·** *ἐξεργάζεσθαι* to finish, to undo. "Not used in Attic *prose*," in the latter sense (Krüger). Cp. 4. 134 and note on *διεργάζοντο* c. 20 *infra.*

αὐτοὶ ἀποσημανέετε· νῦν δέ, σχεδὸν γὰρ ἤδη τῆς κοίτης ὥρη προσέρχεται ὑμῖν καὶ καλῶς ἔχοντας ὑμέας ὁρῶ μέθης, γυναῖκας ταύτας, εἰ ὑμῖν φίλον ἐστί, ἄπετε λούσασθαι, λουσαμένας δὲ ὀπίσω προσδέκεσθε." εἴπας ταῦτα, συνέπαινοι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ Πέρσαι, γυναῖκας μὲν ἐξελθούσας ἀπέπεμπε ἐς τὴν γυναικηίην, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἴσους τῇσι γυναιξὶ ἀριθμὸν ἄνδρας λειογενείους τῇ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐσθῆτι σκευάσας καὶ ἐγχειρίδια δοὺς ἦγε ἔσω, παράγων δὲ τούτους ἔλεγε τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι τάδε. "ὦ Πέρσαι, οἴκατε πανδαισίῃ τελέῃ ἱστιῆσθαι· τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα ὅσα εἴχομεν, καὶ πρὸς τὰ οἷά τε ἦν ἐξευρόντας παρέχειν, πάντα ὑμῖν πάρεστι, καὶ δὴ καὶ τόδε τὸ πάντων μέγιστον, τάς τε ἑωυτῶν μητέρας καὶ τὰς ἀδελφεὰς ἐπιδαψιλευόμεθα ὑμῖν, ὡς παντελέως μάθητε τιμώμενοι πρὸς ἡμέων τῶν πέρ ἐστε ἄξιοι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ βασιλέι τῷ πέμψαντι ἀπαγγείλητε ὡς ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην Μακεδόνων ὕπαρχος εὖ ὑμέας ἐδέξατο καὶ τραπέζῃ καὶ κοίτῃ." ταῦτα εἴπας ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος παρίζει Πέρσῃ ἀνδρὶ ἄνδρα Μακεδόνα ὡς γυναῖκα τῷ λόγῳ· οἱ δέ, ἐπείτε σφέων οἱ Πέρσαι ψαύειν ἐπειρῶντο, διεργάζοντο αὐτούς. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν τούτῳ τῷ μόρῳ διεφθάρησαν, 21
καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἡ θεραπηίη αὐτῶν· εἵπετο γὰρ δή σφι καὶ ὀχήματα καὶ θεράποντες καὶ ἡ πᾶσα πολλὴ παρασκευή· πάντα δὴ ταῦτα ἅμα πᾶσι ἐκείνοισι ἠφάνιστο. μετὰ δὲ χρόνῳ οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον ζήτησις τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων μεγάλη ἐκ τῶν Περσέων ἐγίνετο, καί σφεας Ἀλέξανδρος κατέλαβε σοφίῃ, χρήματά τε δοὺς πολλὰ καὶ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ ἀδελφεὴν τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Γυγαίη· δοὺς δὲ ταῦτα κατέ-

---

20. 7. **λούσασθαι**, to bathe. N.B. the force of the middle voice. In 4. 75 *λοῦσθαι* with acc. but in strict middle sense. Cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

9. **γυναικηίην**· *γυναικηίη* = *γυναικὼν* or *γυναικωνῖτις*. The ground-plan of the palace of Tiryns exhibits the relation of the Harem to the *ἀνδρών*, which seems to be implied in this story of the Macedonian Court. Cp. 4. 95 *supra* and 3. 78.

10. **ἴσους . . ἀριθμόν**. What number is not stated: presumably not less than seven. Cp. c. 17 *supra*: but perhaps many more, if they of the suite (c. 21 *infra*) were present at the banquet.

16. **ἐπιδαψιλευόμεθα**, a rare word. *γέλωτος ἐπιδαψιλεύσῃ* Xen. *Cyrop.* 2. 2, 15. Stein suggests the perfect here (*ἐπιδεδαψιλεύμεθα*).

17. **ἄξιοι**. Again ironical, as likewise the rest of the speech.

18. **Ἕλλην** is perhaps partly the key to the story (cp. c. 22 *infra*).

19. **ὕπαρχος** is an artistic touch, but can hardly here be merely equivalent to 'satrap.'

22. **διεργάζοντο**. Like *ἐξεργάσῃ* above, a poetical word, in this sense. Cp. 5. 92. It is used by Pausanias 4. 4, 2 in the same sense, in a context which probably contains a reminiscence of this passage. *διεργάζεσθαι* has obviously a more concrete sense than *ἐξεργάζεσθαι* *supra*, but that is due not to the preposition but to the context.

21. 2. Were the **ὀχήματα** and **παρασκευή** ever restored? Apparently not (*ἠφάνιστο*).

7. **Γυγαίη**. Of this marriage there can be no doubt. It was a hard fact, making against the reputation of Alexander as a patriotic Hellene. But *ἡ σοφίη* (c. 19 *supra*) is justified of all her children. The story of the destruction of the seven noble Persians and their suite was the best apology for the

λαβε ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος Βουβάρῃ ἀνδρὶ Πέρσῃ, τῶν διζημένων τοὺς ἀπολομένους τῷ στρατηγῷ.

22 Ὁ μέν νυν τῶν Περσέων τούτων θάνατος οὕτω καταλαμφθεὶς ἐσιγήθη. Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδίκκεω γεγονότας, κατά περ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτός τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖσι ὄπισθε λόγοισι ἀποδέξω ὥς εἰσι Ἕλληνες, πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες ἀγῶνα Ἑλληνοδίκαι οὕτω ἔγνωσαν εἶναι. Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ ἀεθλεύειν ἑλομένου καὶ καταβάντος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο, οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἐξεῖργόν μιν, φάμενοι οὐ βαρβάρων ἀγωνιστέων εἶναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων· Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέδεξε ὡς

---

marriage. Cp. c. 22 *infra*. As Alexander, not Amyntas, gives the lady in marriage, the wedding of Gygaea should be dated after Alexander's accession (498 B.C.); *χρόνῳ οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον* just above cannot therefore be pressed.

This marriage is referred to 8. 136, and there can be little hesitation in identifying Bubares, the husband of Gygaea, with Bubares, son of Megabazos, one of the *Epistatai* at Athos in 481-0 B.C. 7. 22, the father Megabazos being none other than the commander in Europe of the passage now before us. Whether the commission of Bubares at Athos had anything to say to his marriage with the Macedonian princess, whether the marriage took place much before his appointment, are open questions. The idea that the marriage was part of the consideration for hushing up the murder of the embassy may be a pragmatic fancy, and may be the ground for the chronological statement *μετὰ δὲ χρόνῳ οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον*.

The vague and clumsy use of *κατέλαβε bis* (*σφεας κατέλαβε, κατέλαβε* absolute), followed by *καταλαμφθεὶς* (c. 22 *θάνατος καταλαμφθεὶς*) seems to betray a bad conscience in the author, or retailer, of this story.

22. 2. **Ἕλληνας εἶναι.** Cp. *ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην*, c. 20 *supra*, the chief point and motive, probably, of the whole story, which is a glowing vindication of the Hellenism of Alexander, in spite of the marriage connexion with the Persians.

3. **αὐτοὶ λέγουσι.** It was no doubt a family claim, and the family probably invented the story which justified the claim. Cp. 8. 137-9, where the family legend is given. For a case in which Hdt. rejects a family tradition, see c. 57 *infra*.

αὐτός. From contact with the family? Cp. c. 17 *supra* and Introduction, p. civ. There are only two proofs below all this verbiage: (1) the 'Argive' legend, (2) the Olympian verdict. The former may have been the ostensible basis of the latter.

4. **ἐν τοῖσι ὄπισθε λόγοισι**, 8. 137-139. Why the story is not told here is not obvious. The most plausible explanation is to be found in the hypothesis that the passage in Bk. 8 was written before the passage in Bk. 5. Cp. Introduction, § 21. It would be interesting to know the exact date of this decision. It may at least be placed before Alexander's accession. Duncker (vii.[5] 100) would put it Ol. 71 = 496 B.C. two years after his accession, but his argument is far from conclusive: and on his own showing Alexander was not merely king, but "at least" 34 years old! On the *Hellenodikai*, cp. Pausan. 5. 9 (397) and 6. 127 *infra*.

7. **ἀντιθευσόμενοι . . ἐξεῖργον.** The pregnant use of the tenses should be observed.

8. **οὐ βαρβάρων.** Cp. the story 2. 160, esp. *οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν καὶ σφέων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων ὁμοίως τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐξεῖναι ἀγωνίζεσθαι.*

The 'tyrannic' argument might have been used against Alexander, cp. 8. 142, specially if he had been king at the time. (Cp. the attempt to exclude Dionysios, Lysias *Or*. 33, Diodor. 14. 109, 3 (725).) His 'barbarism' would have been all the more strongly marked, if Macedon was at the time subject, really or nominally, to Persia. The proof of Hellenism no doubt lay in the story given 8. 137 ff. But the evidence might not have been admitted if policy had

εἴη Ἀργεῖος, ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἕλλην καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρώτῳ.

Ταῦτα μέν νυν οὕτω κῃ ἐγένετο. Μεγάβαζος δὲ ἄγων τοὺς 23 *Παίονας ἀπίκετο ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον· ἐνθεῦτεν διαπεραιωθεὶς ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Σάρδις. ἅτε δὲ τειχέοντος ἤδη Ἱστιαίου τοῦ Μιλησίου τὴν παρὰ Δαρείου αἰτήσας ἔτυχε μισθὸν [δωρεὴν] φυλακῆς τῆς σχεδίης, ἐόντος δὲ τοῦ χώρου τούτου παρὰ Στρυμόνα ποταμὸν τῷ οὔνομά ἐστι Μύρκινος, μαθὼν ὁ Μεγάβαζος τὸ ποιεύ-*

---

not clinched the argument. His Argive claims would not have made him more welcome to Sparta.

11. **τῷ πρώτῳ** can hardly mean *τῷ νικήσαντι*, quite apart from the consideration that the word would not designate his competitor more properly than himself. This objection lies against Stein's interpretation which takes *συνεξέπιπτε* to refer to the final decision of the judges. (Stein adds that the imperfect shows that no decision was reached: but the imperfect need not do that necessarily, and the winners' names in the stadion are recorded, and Alexander's is not among them. Cp. G. H. Förster, *Die olympischen Sieger*, Zwickau, 1891, pp. 10, 11.) It is true that Krysippos the Stoic in his tract on the function of a Judge *ὑποθέμενος δύο δρομεῖς ὁμοῦ συνεκπίπτειν ἀλλήλοις* naturally asked what was the judge to do in such a case of a dead-heat (Plutarch, *Mor.* 1045 D). The meaning in this case is as plain as the grammar: not so in the case above. The observation that *ὁ πρῶτος* can hardly designate either of two coordinates bars the meaning given by Rawlinson: his lot fell out with the first, *i.e.* it fell to his lot to run in the first heat—if *ἀνδρί* is understood: if *κλήρῳ* or some such word, the harshness of the personal subject for *συνεξέπιπτε* is aggravated. Macaulay explains: "he was drawn to run in the first pair." But the foot races at Olympia were not conducted *κατὰ λόγον μουνομαχίης* like contests in Thrace (cp. c. 1, *supra*). One would like to know whether Alexander ran or not, and with what result. Could the meaning be: 'He dropped out of the competition in the first round' (*δρόμῳ*) with the others, *i.e.* he was beaten in the first heat (no wonder, if he was 34 years of age) though he was not the only one beaten. The use of *συνεκπίπτειν* elsewhere in Hdt. (1. 206, 8. 49, 123) might be thought to support the rendering of Rawlinson, but for the objections urged: the uses of *ἐκπίπτειν* will be admitted to render the meaning above suggested plausible (5. 72, 6. 121 *et al.*).

23. 1. **τοὺς Παίονας.** Cp. c. 17 *supra ad init.*

2. **ἀπίκετο.** Without waiting apparently to learn the fate of the embassy to Aigai! The connexion, grammatical and material, of the opening of c. 17 with this passage (*ἤγοντο . . Μεγάβαζος δὲ . . Μεγάβαζος δὲ ἄγων . .*) supports the view that cc. 17-22 are an insertion. Van Herwerden deletes the second *ἀπίκετο*.

4. **δωρεήν.** Stein brackets after Dobree. Might we not prefer *ἔτυχε δωρεὴν μισθὸν* or *χώρην*? For the matter see c. 11 *supra*.

6. **τὸ ποιεύμενον.** Not the mere fortification but the whole political design.

The notion that in those days Thrace might be united, Greeks and barbarians, under an Hellenic monarch (cp. c. 3 *supra*) and made the seat of an empire, which should be a serious danger to the Persian, looks more like an anachronism (cp. c. 49 *infra*) than a true prophecy (*εὖ προορῶν τὸ μέλλον γίνεσθαι*). If Histiaios was so clever and so ambitious as Megabazos represents, he might have kept out of the lion's den. Blakesley, who makes Histiaios into a sort of "satrap over all the Ionian cities," thinks that "a man so powerful" only just missed the establishment of an empire which would perhaps have forestalled Alexander. There is a want of balance about this: and the student of Hdt. must allow for the influence of later events and interests on the tradition of earlier stages. The colonisation of Thrace during the *Pentekontaetia* may have affected the memory of earlier adventures in the same region. Duncker suggests that the younger Zopyros son of Megabazos grandson of the Conspirator (see 3. 153, 160) may have been Hdt.'s authority for this story. But the whole

μενον ἐκ τοῦ Ἱστιαίου, ὡς ἦλθε τάχιστα ἐς τὰς Σάρδις ἄγων τοὺς Παίονας, ἔλεγε Δαρείῳ τάδε. "ὦ βασιλεῦ, κοῖόν τι χρῆμα ἐποίησας, ἀνδρὶ Ἕλληνι δεινῷ τε καὶ σοφῷ δοὺς ἐγκτίσασθαι πόλιν ἐν Θρηίκῃ, ἵνα ἴδη τε ναυπηγήσιμός ἐστι ἄφθονος καὶ πολλοὶ κωπέες καὶ μέταλλα ἀργύρεα, ὅμιλός τε πολλὸς μὲν Ἕλλην περιοικέει πολλὸς δὲ βάρβαρος, οἳ προστάτεω ἐπιλαβόμενοι ποιήσουσι τοῦτο τὸ ἂν κεῖνος ἐξηγέηται καὶ ἡμέρης καὶ νυκτός. σύ νυν τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα παῦσον ταῦτα ποιεῦντα, ἵνα μὴ οἰκηίῳ πολέμῳ συνέχῃ· τρόπῳ δὲ ἠπίῳ μεταπεμψάμενος παῦσον. ἐπεὰν δὲ αὐτὸν περιλάβῃς, ποιέειν ὅκως μηκέτι κεῖνος

24 ἐς Ἕλληνας ἀπίξεται." ταῦτα λέγων ὁ Μεγάβαζος εὐπετέως ἔπειθε Δαρεῖον ὡς εὖ προορῶν τὸ μέλλον γίνεσθαι. μετὰ δὲ πέμψας ἄγγελον ἐς τὴν Μύρκινον ὁ Δαρεῖος ἔλεγε τάδε. "Ἱστιαῖε, βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος τάδε λέγει. ἐγὼ φροντίζων εὑρίσκω ἐμοί τε καὶ τοῖσι ἐμοῖσι πρήγμασι εἶναι οὐδένα σεῦ ἄνδρα εὐνοέστερον· τοῦτο δὲ οὐ λόγοισι ἀλλ' ἔργοισι οἶδα μαθών. νῦν ὦν, ἐπινοέω γὰρ πρήγματα μεγάλα κατεργάσασθαι, ἀπίκεό μοι πάντως, ἵνα τοι αὐτὰ ὑπερθέωμαι." τούτοισι τοῖσι ἔπεσι πιστεύσας ὁ Ἱστιαῖος, καὶ ἅμα μέγα ποιεύμενος βασιλέος σύμβουλος γενέσθαι, ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Σάρδις· ἀπικομένῳ δέ οἱ ἔλεγε Δαρεῖος τάδε. "Ἱστιαῖε, ἐγώ σε μετεπεμψάμην τῶνδε εἵνεκεν. ἐπείτε τάχιστα ἐνόστησα ἀπὸ Σκυθέων καὶ σύ μοι ἐγένεο ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν, οὐδέν κω ἄλλο χρῆμα οὕτω ἐν βραχέι ἐπεζήτησα ὡς σὲ ἰδεῖν τε καὶ ἐς λόγους μοι ἀπικέσθαι, ἐγνωκὼς ὅτι κτημάτων πάντων ἐστὶ τιμιώτατον ἀνὴρ φίλος συνετός τε καὶ εὔνοος, τά τοι ἐγὼ καὶ ἀμφότερα συνειδὼς ἔχω μαρτυρέειν ἐς πρήγματα τὰ ἐμά. νῦν ὦν, εὖ γὰρ ἐποίησας ἀπικόμενος, τάδε τοι ἐγὼ προτείνομαι· Μίλητον μὲν ἔα καὶ τὴν νεόκτιστον ἐν Θρηίκῃ πόλιν, σὺ δέ μοι ἑπόμενος ἐς Σοῦσα

---

career of Histiaios was richly treated, we may be sure, in Ionian, and specially in Milesian, tradition, and there are no convincing inner indications of a Persian source for this part of the story, though R. suggests that "day and night" is an orientalism.

7. **Σάρδις.** Dareios is still at Sardes on the return of Megabazos. This gives time for Duncker's hypothesis that the events narrated by Hdt., 3. 129-138, should be inserted here, cp. Introduction, p. xxxv.

15. **οἰκηίῳ πολέμῳ.** Thuc. 1. 118, cp. *οἰκήια κακά* 6. 21 *infra*.

24. 1. **ὁ Μεγάβαζος εὐπετέως ἔπειθε Δαρεῖον.** Tradition or afterthought had to explain the transfer of Histiaios from Ionia to Susa: the explanation is furnished in these chapters (23, 24). The contrast between the message and the speech of Dareios had they been genuine would have opened the eyes of Histiaios. The *μεγάλα πρήγματα* of the despatch disappear in the speech. The anecdote is artistic, *e.g.* the contrast between *ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην δεινός τε καὶ σοφός* in the mouth of Megabazos to Dareios, and *ἀνὴρ φίλος συνετός τε καὶ εὔνοος* in the mouth of Dareios to Histiaios. Hdt. has no misgiving in reporting the very words of these intimate interviews, any more than in determining the inmost motives of his *dramatis personae*.

ἔχε τά περ ἂν ἐγὼ ἔχω, ἐμός τε σύσσιτος ἐὼν καὶ συμβουλος."
ταῦτα Δαρεῖος εἴπας, καὶ καταστήσας Ἀρταφρένεα ἀδελφεὸν 25
ἑωυτοῦ ὁμοπάτριον ὕπαρχον εἶναι Σαρδίων, ἀπήλαυνε ἐς Σοῦσα
ἅμα ἀγόμενος Ἱστιαῖον, Ὀτάνεα δὲ ἀποδέξας στρατηγὸν εἶναι τῶν
παραθαλασσίων ἀνδρῶν· τοῦ τὸν πατέρα Σισάμνην βασιλεὺς
Καμβύσης γενόμενον τῶν βασιληίων δικαστέων, ὅτι ἐπὶ χρήμασι
δίκην ἄδικον ἐδίκασε, σφάξας ἀπέδειρε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀνθρωπέην,
σπαδίξας δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ δέρμα ἱμάντας ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔταμε καὶ ἐνέτεινε
τὸν θρόνον ἐς τὸν ἵζων ἐδίκαζε· ἐντανύσας δὲ ὁ Καμβύσης ἀπέδεξε
δικαστὴν εἶναι ἀντὶ τοῦ Σισάμνεω, τὸν ἀποκτείνας ἀπέδειρε, τὸν
παῖδα τοῦ Σισάμνεω, ἐντειλάμενός οἱ μεμνῆσθαι ἐν τῷ κατίζων
θρόνῳ δικάζει. οὗτος ὦν ὁ Ὀτάνης, ὁ ἐγκατιζόμενος ἐς τοῦτον 26
τὸν θρόνον, τότε διάδοχος γενόμενος Μεγαβάζῳ τῆς στρατηγίης,
Βυζαντίους τε εἷλε καὶ Καλχηδονίους, εἷλε δὲ Ἄντανδρον τὴν ἐν

---

25. 1. καταστήσας Ἀρταφρένεα . . ἀπήλαυνε. Dareios' departure from Sardes for Susa apparently takes pla_e before the expulsion of Hippias from Athens, or at least before his application at Sardes, c. 96 *infra*. Dareios may have spent the winter of 512-11 B.C. at Sardes: or his return to Susa may have been delayed by his sickness (3. 129) till the spring of 510 B.C.

Artaphrenes (father of the younger Artaphrenes who accompanied Datis 6. 94) was plainly satrap in Sardes: Oibares son of Megabazos (6. 33) may have been appointed satrap in Daskyleion at the same time. The exact position of Otanes, and his exact relation to the satraps in Sardes and in Daskyleion, are obscure points. He is here described as *στρατηγὸς τῶν παραθαλασσίων ἀνδρῶν*, and in the next chapter as *διάδοχος Μεγαβάζῳ τῆς στρατηγίης*. The latter expression probably explains the former, and the *παραθαλάσσιοι ἄνδρες* here are not, as Stein takes it, the *ἐπιθαλάσσιοι οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ* of c. 30 *infra* or the *tyiya darayahyâ* 'those which are of the sea' (*i.e.* the islands, R.) of the Behistun inscription, col. 1, § 6, nor may we see in his position an exact anticipation of that of the younger Cyrus, Xen. *Hell.* 1. 4, 3, *Anabasis* 1. 1, 6 ff. 9, 7 ff., with Grote, vol. vi. p. 359; but rather this Otanes may be regarded simply as a military official without any political duties (*στρατηγὸς . . ἀνδρῶν*) in succession to Megabazos, cp. c. 123 *infra*, though his exact relation to the satraps may not have been very clearly defined. His headquarters appear to be on the Hellespont. His name was had in remembrance there, for good reasons, cc. 26, 123 *infra*. Blakesley warns against confusing this Otanes, son of Sisamnes, with Otanes, one of the fathers-in-law of Dareios, whose father's name is given in 3. 68 as Pharnaspes, and on the Behistun inscription, col. 4, § 18, as Socris. The name was probably not uncommon, and is interpreted as = *εὐσώματος*, cp. Rawlinson, vol. iii.[3] p. 548.

4. τοῦ τὸν πατέρα κτλ. This grim practical jest was worthy of a madman: but is hardly a worse jest than sane kings might perpetrate (cp. 4. 84), and seems to have been approved by the Father of English Poetry. Cp. Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, Bk. vii. (ed. Morley, 1889, p. 375).

26. 3. Βυζαντίους κτλ. If Otanes had to reduce Byzantion, Chalkedon, Antandros and Lamponion, it is obvious that these places had revolted from the Persian after the disaster in Scythia. Ktesias, *Pers.* § 48 (ed. Gilmore, p. 151), apparently made Dareios burn down the houses and temples of Chalkedon. Polyainos (7. 10, 5) gives an account of a siege and capture of the town by a mine, or tunnel. If the Byzantines were reduced, it may be supposed that their loyal despot Ariston (4. 138) was restored. Lemnos and Imbros were new acquisitions for the Persian: not so Lesbos, where Koes was presumably already Tyrant, c. 11 *supra*.

τῇ Τρῳάδι γῇ, εἷλε δὲ Λαμπώνιον, λαβὼν δὲ παρὰ Λεσβίων νέας εἷλε Λῆμνόν τε καὶ Ἴμβρον, ἀμφοτέρας ἔτι τότε ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν
27 *οἰκεομένας. οἱ μὲν δὴ Λήμνιοι καὶ ἐμαχέσαντο εὖ καὶ ἀμυνόμενοι ἀνὰ χρόνον ἐκακώθησαν, τοῖσι δὲ περιεοῦσι αὐτῶν οἱ Πέρσαι ὕπαρχον ἐπιστᾶσι Λυκάρητον τὸν Μαιανδρίου τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος Σάμου ἀδελφεόν. οὗτος ὁ Λυκάρητος ἄρχων ἐν Λήμνῳ τελευτᾷ. αἰτίη δὲ τούτου ἥδε· πάντας ἠνδραποδίζετο καὶ κατεστρέφετο τοὺς μὲν λιποστρατίης ἐπὶ Σκύθας αἰτιώμενος, τοὺς δὲ σίνασθαι τὸν Δαρείου στρατὸν ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ὀπίσω ἀποκομιζόμενον.*

28 *Οὗτος δὲ τοσαῦτα ἐξεργάσατο στρατηγήσας. μετὰ δὲ οὐ*

---

5. **ἀμφοτέρας ἔτι τότε.** As Miltiades subsequently drave the Pelasgi out of Lemnos (6. 140) they only remained in Imbros. Perhaps as Blakesley suggests the mention of the Pelasgi may be meant as some excuse for the action of the Lesbians. Apparently Koes having won a tyrannis for himself in Lesbos assists the Persians to establish a tyrannis, under Lykaretos brother of Maiandrios *king* of Samos, in Lemnos. The word tyranny is however avoided (*ὕπαρχον . . ἄρχων*) for Lykaretos as for his brother. The 'reign' of Maiandrios had been short, cp. 3. 142. Lykaretos had entertained ambition of succeeding him at Samos, 3. 143. If Hdt.'s chronological indications are correct Aiakes, son of Syloson, was by this time tyrant of Samos (cp. 4. 138, 6. 13). The government had been put into the hands of Syloson (brother of Polykrates) soon after the accession of Dareios, by that Otanes who was one of the Seven (3. 141).

27. 4. **τελευτᾷ**, probably before the conquest by Miltiades 6. 140.

The text of this chapter is unsatisfactory and in disorder: "locus perversus" Stein. The *αἰτίη* given in the closing lines plainly refers to the reductions of Byzantion etc. enumerated in c. 26. Cp. Grote, vi. 204 note [2], 207 *n.* Schweig. supposes the words *οἱ μὲν . . τελευτᾷ* to be a later addition, by the author. Blakesley would be content to bracket *οὗτος . . τελευτᾷ* as such. Cobet supplies *μισεύμενος ὑπὸ πάντων* after *τελευτᾷ*: sed plura periisse videntur, van Herwerden.

6. *λιποστρατίη* and *σίνος* inflicted on the army (cp. 8. 65, 9. 49), doubtless genuine and well-deserved charges, and in so far conflicting with the criticism of the Scythians 4. 142 *supra*.

28. 1. **τοσαῦτα**, 'this was all he accomplished.' Cp. c. 50 *infra*.

μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον ἄνεσις κακῶν ἦν, a celebrated *crux* (cp. Grote, iii. 491 *n.*). The MSS. read *ἄνεως* or *ἄνεος* of which no sense can be made. *κακῶν* and *κακὰ* look a little suspicious.

Whether we adopt *ἄνεσις* with de la Barre, Stein, Holder, and the editors generally, or *ἀνανέωσις* (which better explains the corruption, but would require Grote's punctuation) the sense arrived at will be much the same, viz., that after the campaign of Otanes described cc. 26, 27 there was a brief pause or interval of peace and recuperation until fresh trouble fell upon the Greeks in Asia, growing out of the relations of Naxos and Miletos. Rawlinson observes that Grote's proposed punctuation *μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον, ἄνεσις κακῶν ἦν καὶ* gives no sense at all. Can it be that Grote understood *ἄνεσις* to mean 'a letting loose'? (L. & S. *sub v.* II.), a sense here inadmissible. (*ἄνεσις, κατάπαυσις* Hesychios.) *μετὰ* here is an adverb, though if *ἀνανέωσις* be read *μετὰ* must be taken as a preposition.

If the exact material significance of the words *οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον* could be determined, the chronology of the period would become a good deal clearer. Rawlinson even says: "the chronology of Dareios' reign depends almost entirely on what we are to understand by this expression." He approves of Clinton's "two years." But it is no use determining first of all what a purely indeterminate expression means, and then arguing back to the chronological perspective. The result in R.'s case is that he brings down the Scythic expedition to 508 B.C. subsequent to the expulsion of Hippias from Athens. This vague expression must be interpreted in the light of the general chrono-

πολλὸν χρόνον ἄνεσις κακῶν ἦν, καὶ ἤρχετο τὸ δεύτερον ἐκ Νάξου τε καὶ Μιλήτου Ἴωσι γίνεσθαι κακά. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἡ Νάξος εὐδαιμονίῃ τῶν νήσων προέφερε, τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον

---

logical perspective: so interpreted it must be taken to stand for more than two years: probably for four or five years. The ἀρχὴ κακῶν is the στάσις in Naxos, or rather the application of the Naxian oligarchs to the Milesian despot: the date of which is *circa* 501 B.C. The operations of Otanes fall a year or two after the return of Dareios to Susa, *circa* 510 B.C. Cp. Appendix V.

2. **καί.** For the *parataxis* cp. 4. 181. Abicht adds cc. 41, 86, 108 *infra*.

τὸ δεύτερον. More precise than δεύτερα, c. 38 *infra*. What was the first time? Probably the Persian conquest in the time of Kyros (cp. 6. 32), not merely the operations of Otanes above recorded. The Ionians, in Ionia at least, had not been sufferers in the recent campaigns: probably very much the reverse.

3. **γὰρ** seems to have more than a temporal or narrative force here: the fact of synchronous prosperity is a reason for expecting the mutual origin of disaster, cp. c. 33 *infra*.

4. **εὐδαιμονίῃ.** Naxos had apparently thriven under the despotism of Lygdamis and the patronage of Peisistratos (560-528 B.C.). The despotism of Lygdamis had made way (with or without a helping hand from Sparta, cp. 3. 56, Plutarch, *Mor.* 859) for a (commercial) oligarchy, probably of the Corinthian type (*circa* 520 B.C.?). The growth of democracy at Athens, and the establishment of the Kleisthenean constitution (*c.* 508 B.C., cp. c. 66 *infra*) may have stimulated the democratic movement in Naxos, culminating in the exile of some of the leading 'men of substance' (c. 30 *infra*, *circa* 504-3 B.C.) Tradition represented the Naxians as able in their heyday to put 8000 hoplites in the field, to say nothing of galleys (πλοῖα μακρὰ πολλά), slaves (rowers, c. 31) and material (χρήματα πολλὰ c. 31). Naxos, however, suffered from the Persians in 490 B.C., 6. 96. Four ships were all they transferred to the national Fleet at Salamis in 480 (8. 46). As tributaries of Athens they paid at most but half the assessment of Paros (cp. *C.I.A.* i. p. 234). Their (probable) rivals the Parians rose on the ruins of their fortunes. Cp. 6. 133.

τῶν νήσων. Paros, Andros, Delos, etc., cp. c. 31 *infra*.

κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον. Hdt. here, following probably good authority, perhaps Hekataios, makes the prosperity of Miletos synchronise with the prosperity of Naxos, and particularly with the regime of Histiaios. Later authorities placed the θαλασσοκρατία of Miletos about 750-730 B.C., and her colonies may have been founded in the seventh and eighth centuries. Cp. Rawlinson's note *ad l.* Miletos has previously figured as a flourishing place in the days of Thrasybulos, Alyattes, and Periandros of Corinth, c. 92 ζ *infra*, 1. 20 ff. (*c.* 600-580 B.C.). In fact there was apparently a revival under Histiaios of Milesian prosperity, which again coincides with a 'despotic' régime, under Persian auspices. How and when Histiaios became tyrant we are left to conjecture. One γενεὴ before the Scythic expedition would bring us back to the treaty with Kyros (546 B.C.), surely a prosperous moment in Milesian annals. A second generation would take us to 580 B.C. about the date of Thrasybulos. The story of the Parian arbitration and constitution in Miletos is very suspicious. Stein quotes Athenaeus 524 (*sc.* Herakleides Pont.) to the effect that after the fall of the Neleids a struggle broke out between the Rich, *i.e.* the Hellenic immigrants, and the Demos, *i.e.* subject Karians called Γέργιθες. It would be in accordance with analogy if the tyrannis at Miletos marked an upward movement of the Γέργιθες. The tyrannis at Miletos thus appears doubly anti-Hellenic, as Karian and as Persian, but the first tyrannis was at least a bulwark against Lydia (1. 20 ff.). The two generations of στάσις may be the period intervening between the tyranny of Thrasybulos and the tyranny of Histiaios, but if so the mediation of the Parians can hardly be placed at its latter end, or must be regarded as singularly unsuccessful. A friendship between Paros and Miletos would not tend to the prosperity of Naxos, but might be thereby explicable.

ἡ Μίλητος αὐτή τε ἑωυτῆς μάλιστα δὴ τότε ἀκμάσασα καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἰωνίης ἦν πρόσχημα, κατύπερθε δὲ τούτων ἐπὶ δύο γενεὰς ἀνδρῶν νοσήσασα ἐς τὰ μάλιστα στάσι, μέχρι οὗ μιν Πάριοι κατήρτισαν· τούτους γὰρ καταρτιστῆρας ἐκ πάντων Ἑλλήνων

29 εἵλοντο οἱ Μιλήσιοι. κατήλλαξαν δέ σφεας ὧδε Πάριοι. ὡς ἀπίκοντο αὐτῶν ἄνδρες οἱ ἄριστοι ἐς τὴν Μίλητον, ὥρων γὰρ δή σφεας δεινῶς οἰκοφθορημένους, ἔφασαν αὐτῶν βούλεσθαι διεξελθεῖν τὴν χώρην· ποιεῦντες δὲ ταῦτα καὶ διεξιόντες πᾶσαν τὴν Μιλησίην, ὅκως τινὰ ἴδοιεν ἐν ἀνεστηκυίῃ τῇ χώρῃ ἀγρὸν εὖ ἐξεργασμένον, ἀπεγράφοντο τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ δεσπότεω τοῦ ἀγροῦ. διεξελάσαντες δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν χώρην καὶ σπανίους εὑρόντες τούτους, ὡς τάχιστα κατέβησαν ἐς τὸ ἄστυ, ἁλίην ποιησάμενοι ἀπέδεξαν τούτους μὲν τὴν πόλιν νέμειν τῶν εὗρον τοὺς ἀγροὺς εὖ ἐξεργασμένους· δοκέειν γὰρ ἔφασαν καὶ τῶν δημοσίων οὕτω δή σφεας ἐπιμελήσεσθαι ὥσπερ τῶν σφετέρων· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Μιλησίους τοὺς πρὶν στασιάζοντας τούτων ἔταξαν πείθεσθαι.

---

6. **Ἰωνίης πρόσχημα.** On 'Ionia' cp. c. 30 *infra*. *πρόσχημα* cp. Soph. *El.* 681 *τὸ κλεινὸν* Ἑλλάδος *πρόσχημα* = Delphi.

7. **νοσήσασα . . στάσι.** Cp. Aristoph. *Wasps* 651 *ἰάσασθαι νόσον ἀρχαίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐντετοκυῖαν.*

9. **εἵλοντο.** The method of appointment is observable. Cp. 4. 161.

29. 2. **ἄριστοι.** Paros at the time was evidently under the government of the Few.

5. **ἀνεστηκυίῃ.** Cp. *ἡσυχάσασα ἡ* Ἑλλὰς *καὶ οὐκέτι ἀνισταμένη* Thuc. 1. 12.

6. **ἀπεγράφοντο** (mid.). They had a secretary with them. To the document Hdt. or more probably his primary authority may have had access. It is perhaps even possible that this list of landlords, and the action of the Parians, may have been inscribed at Miletos, Branchidae, or elsewhere, though the evidence would hardly have survived the suppression of the Ionian revolt. Cp. 6. 19.

δεσπότεω τοῦ ἀγροῦ. The expression seems to suggest slave labour. Cp. Solon's line on Γῆ *μέλαινα* (Bergk, ii.[4] p. 56): *πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύουσα νῦν ἐλευθέρα.*

8. **ἁλίην·** *ποιεῖσθαι*, to convene an assembly as c. 79 *infra* of Thebans, 1. 125 of Persians. Cp. *ἁλίης πολλάκις συλλεγομένης* 7. 134 at Sparta (where the technical word was perhaps *ἀπέλλα*). The word *ἁλία* is found on the inscriptions of Korkyra, Sicily, and Magna Graecia; for reff. see L. & S. *sub v.* and more fully, Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* ii. 309 n.[1] It is found in a decree of the Byzantines, *ap.* Demosth. *Or.* 18. 90 (*de Corona*). The term officially employed at Halikarnassos, Miletos, and in Ionia generally, would probably have been *ἀγορά*. Cp. 6. 11, and note on names in c. 30 *infra* (*ἐκκλησία* in Xen. *Hell.* 1. 6. 8 would not disprove it). Is it too much to suggest that Hdt. may have come by this phrase in the west? The Sybarites might have traditions concerning Miletos, cp. 6. 21.

10. **οὕτω.** It may be inferred that the constitution drawn by the Parians was too good to last. Hdt. has here, in his way, brought in a good story which has no obvious bearing on the situation. What needs to be explained is how the Naxian oligarchs found Miletos under a despotism. That at some time or other Parian *καταρτιστῆρες* were called in at Miletos is probable enough. The practice of Arbitration whether between (*a*) parties in a city or (*b*) city and city was largely resorted to by the Greeks. It is a kind of jurisdiction, an alternative to force and diplomacy. For examples of (*a*) beside the case of Miletos in the text, cp. 4. 161. As examples of (*b*) cp. 5. 95, 6. 108, 7. 144. Such precedents might have their use for Athens. Cp. Thuc. 1. 115. See further, Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* ii. 392.

Πάριοι μέν νυν Μιλησίους οὕτω κατήρτισαν. τότε δὲ ἐκ 30
τουτέων τῶν πολίων ὧδε ἤρχετο κακὰ γίνεσθαι τῇ Ἰωνίῃ. ἐκ Νάξου ἔφυγον ἄνδρες τῶν παχέων ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου, φυγόντες δὲ ἀπίκοντο ἐς Μίλητον. τῆς δὲ Μιλήτου ἐτύγχανε ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μολπαγόρεω, γαμβρός τε ἐὼν καὶ ἀνεψιὸς Ἱστιαίου τοῦ Λυσαγόρεω, τὸν ὁ Δαρεῖος ἐν Σούσοισι κατεῖχε· ὁ γὰρ Ἱστιαῖος τύραννος ἦν Μιλήτου καὶ ἐτύγχανε τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἐὼν ἐν Σούσοισι, ὅτε οἱ Νάξιοι ἦλθον ξεῖνοι πρὶν ἐόντες

---

30. 1. **τότε δὲ** goes back to τότε ἀκμάσασα c. 28, all that follows πρόσχημα being probably a digression, not found in Hekataios, or in Hdt.'s authorities for the story of the Ionian Revolt. The sentence somewhat clumsily resumes the narrative broken by the digression.

2. **Ἰωνίῃ** more restricted than Ἴωσι c. 28 *supra*, and used here probably in a strictly geographical sense. In this sense it is contrasted with Kypros c. 109 *infra*, with Sicily 6. 22, with Peloponnesos 6. 86, with the Hellespont 8. 109. Naxos is 'near' or 'off' it c. 31 *infra*, 'Aiolis' is 'next' it c. 123 *infra*, Teos is in its midst 1. 170. Men can sail to it c. 115 *infra*, march to it 1. 162, be in it 1. 170, leave it 1. 163. It can be devastated, but not being an island the Sagene cannot sweep it, 6. 31. It is a district with a most beautiful climate, 1. 142, made up of the territories of twelve city-states, enumerated 1. 142, two of the number, Samos and Chios, being islands. In two passages however 'Ionia' is used in other than a geographical sense: Ἰωνίην πᾶσαν πλὴν Ἀθηναίων 7. 51, and τοῖσι Ἰωνίης μέτα οὐδὲ τοῦ οὐνόματος οὐδὲν 1. 146. Ionians in fact are not confined to Ionia proper. To restrict ourselves to Hdt.: the presence of Ionians is attested in 'the Islands' 1. 171, 7. 95. In Naxos, Keos, Seriphos, Euboea, 8. 46. In Delos, 4. 35. In Europe, 7. 9. Athens, regarded as the 'Metropolis' of the Ionians, 1. 143, 146, 7. 95, 9. 106. The Dodekapolis however going back to Achaia, and the Peloponnese 1. 145, where Ionians were still to be found, 8. 73. Cp. 7. 94, 9. 26. On the Ionism of the colonies farther east and west Hdt. does not happen to insist. That he is no admirer of the Ionians is shown by the following passage, 1. 143. The Ionians form the weakest branch of the Hellenic stock: the Athenians and everyone else are ashamed of the name except the twelve cities, who glory in their shame, 1. 143. Kleisthenes of Athens set them at naught 5. 69. Kyros made no account of them 1. 153. Kambyses regarded them as slaves 2. 1. The Scythians, utter barbarians, gave them the unkindest cut of all 4. 142. Their bad qualities are conspicuous at Lade 6. 11, 12, 13. Hdt. combats the geography of their wise men 2. 16, 4. 36, makes fun of their δίαιτα 4. 95, traces the father of Ionian philosophy to the abhorred Phoenician stock 1. 74, and seems to think little of their great lights (4. 95, 96; cp. 2. 123) though he has perhaps more kindness for the Samian than for the Milesian school, 3. 60. Cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.

5. **Ἀρισταγόρης.** The names of the dynastic clique are noticeable. Histiaios is son of Lys*agoras*, Arist*agoras*, his nephew and son-in-law, is the son of Molp*agoras*, and perhaps Iatr*agoras* mentioned c. 37 *infra* was, as Stein suggests, a relation. The names have a popular ring: cp. 6. 11 and c. 29 *supra*.

Aristagoras is here mentioned for the first time, but that Histiaios, 'Tyrant of Miletos,' should be introduced again as though he had not already played an important rôle in Hdt.'s narrative, looks a little as though we were here on the trace of an originally independent source, or story.

8. **ξεῖνοι.** So the tyrant of Athens finds friends at Sparta, cc. 63, 90 *infra*; in 431 B.C. Evarchos tyrant of Astakos is restored by the Corinthians, Thuc. 2. 33. However unnatural the friendship between oligarchy and tyrannis (cp. the story of Gelon 7. 155) special circumstances might lead to a community of interests between these natural opposites. In this case the friendship of the Milesian oligarchs with

τῷ Ἱστιαίῳ. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ οἱ Νάξιοι ἐς τὴν Μίλητον ἐδέοντο τοῦ Ἀρισταγόρεω, εἴ κως αὐτοῖσι παράσχοι δύναμίν τινα καὶ κατέλθοιεν ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν. ὁ δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος ὡς ἢν δι' αὐτοῦ κατέλθωσι ἐς τὴν πόλιν, ἄρξει τῆς Νάξου, σκῆψιν δὲ ποιεύμενος τὴν ξεινίην τὴν Ἱστιαίου, τόνδε σφι λόγον προσέφερε. "αὐτὸς μὲν ὑμῖν οὐ φερέγγυός εἰμι δύναμιν παρασχεῖν τοσαύτην ὥστε κατάγειν ἀεκόντων τῶν τὴν πόλιν ἐχόντων Ναξίων· πυνθάνομαι γὰρ ὀκτακισχιλίην ἀσπίδα Ναξίοισι εἶναι καὶ πλοῖα μακρὰ πολλά· μηχανήσομαι δὲ πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιεύμενος. ἐπινοέω δὲ τῇδε. Ἀρταφρένης μοι τυγχάνει ἐὼν φίλος· ὁ δὲ Ἀρταφρένης ὑμῖν Ὑστάσπεος μέν ἐστι παῖς, Δαρείου δὲ τοῦ βασιλέος ἀδελφεός, τῶν δ' ἐπιθαλασσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ ἄρχει πάντων, ἔχων στρατιήν τε πολλὴν καὶ πολλὰς νέας. τοῦτον ὦν δοκέω τὸν ἄνδρα ποιήσειν τῶν ἂν χρηίζωμεν." ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες οἱ Νάξιοι προσέθεσαν τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ πρήσσειν τῇ δύναιτο ἄριστα, καὶ ὑπίσχεσθαι δῶρα ἐκέλευον καὶ δαπάνην τῇ στρατιῇ ὡς αὐτοὶ διαλύσοντες, ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχοντες, ὅταν ἐπιφανέωσι ἐς τὴν Νάξον, πάντα ποιήσειν τοὺς Ναξίους τὰ ἂν αὐτοὶ κελεύωσι, ὡς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νησιώτας. τῶν γὰρ νήσων τουτέων τῶν Κυκλά-

---

the Parians might be an additional reason for a good understanding between the Milesian tyrant and the Naxians.

11. **ἐπιλεξάμενος.** Hdt. shows a remarkable assurance in dealing with the motives of Aristagoras. Cp. c. 35 *infra*; Introduction, p. cvi.

12. **σκῆψιν.** Aristagoras laid stress on the obligation, in order to conceal his true motive, and then concluded his speech as follows.

15. **πυνθάνομαι.** There would have been no use in exaggerating the power of the Naxians to the exiles, who could have put him right immediately, but whether the whole 8000 shields stand for free men of Naxos may be doubted. 8000 is the reported number of Spartiatae 7. 234 in 480 B.C.

19. **ὑμῖν,** 'you know.'

Whatever the meaning of *ἐπιθαλάσσιοι* there must be an exaggeration here, in *τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ πάντων*. In regard to the former word, the question arises whether the position of Artaphrenes as here described is reconcilable with the position of Otanes described c. 25 *supra* as *στρατηγὸς τῶν παραθαλασσίων ἀνδρῶν*, assuming the *παραθαλάσσιοι* there to be the same as the *ἐπιθαλάσσιοι* here. Yes, on any one of these hypotheses: (1) Otanes' command might now be over. See *τοσαῦτα ἐξεργάσατο στρατηγήσας* c. 28 *supra*: but how reconcile this with c. 123 *infra*? (2) The Strategos was subordinate to the Satrap, at least in this case. (3) *ἐπιθαλάσσιοι* = on the Aegean, *παραθαλάσσιοι* = on the Hellespont. That distinction may be materially correct, but the words can hardly have such a technical meaning. (4) Aristagoras was deliberately exaggerating or dramatically represented as deliberately exaggerating. But as above explained, note c. 25, if we understand Otanes as successor to Megabazos in command of an army on the coast (*οἱ παραθ. ἄνδρες*) there is no need for an harmonistic attempt to reconcile this and that passage, though of course there is stress to be laid on the difference of the prepositions, and this passage remains an exaggeration of the satrap's authority, which probably extended only over the first 'nome' as described in 3. 90.

24. **δαπάνη.** *τῶν ἀναισιμωμάτων τῇ στρατιῇ* c. 31 *infra*.

25. **ἐλπίδας πολλάς.** A phrase curiously common in the story of the Ionian revolt. Cp. c. 36 *infra*.

27. **τῶν Κυκλάδων** looks like a gloss, cp. *τὰς Κυκλάδας καλευμένας* next c. The name was probably used, perhaps

δων οὐδεμία κω ἦν ὑπὸ Δαρείῳ. ἀπικόμενος δὲ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης 31
ἐς τὰς Σάρδις λέγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀρταφρένεα ὡς Νάξος εἴη νῆσος μεγάθεϊ μὲν οὐ μεγάλη, ἄλλως δὲ καλή τε καὶ ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἀγχοῦ Ἰωνίης, χρήματα δὲ ἔνι πολλὰ καὶ ἀνδράποδα. "σὺ ὦν ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν χώρην στρατηλάτεε, κατάγων ἐς αὐτὴν τοὺς φυγάδας ἐξ αὐτῆς. καί τοι ταῦτα ποιήσαντι τοῦτο μέν ἐστι ἕτοιμα παρ' ἐμοὶ χρήματα μεγάλα πάρεξ τῶν ἀναισιμωμάτων τῇ στρατιῇ· ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ δίκαιον ἡμέας τοὺς ἄγοντας παρέχειν ἐστί· τοῦτο δὲ νήσους βασιλέι προσκτήσεαι αὐτήν τε Νάξον καὶ τὰς ἐκ ταύτης ἠρτημένας, Πάρον καὶ Ἄνδρον καὶ ἄλλας τὰς Κυκλάδας καλευμένας. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁρμώμενος εὐπετέως ἐπιθήσεαι Εὐβοίῃ νήσῳ μεγάλῃ τε καὶ εὐδαίμονι, οὐκ ἐλάσσονι Κύπρου καὶ κάρτα εὐπετέι αἱρεθῆναι. ἀποχρῶσι δὲ ἑκατὸν νέες ταύτας πάσας χειρώσασθαι." ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο αὐτὸν τοισίδε. "σὺ ἐς οἶκον τὸν βασιλέος ἐξηγητὴς γίνεαι πρηγμάτων ἀγαθῶν, καὶ ταῦτα εὖ παραινέεις πάντα, πλὴν τῶν νεῶν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ· ἀντὶ δὲ ἑκατὸν νεῶν διηκόσιαί τοι ἕτοιμοι ἔσονται ἅμα τῷ ἔαρι. δεῖ δὲ τούτοισι καὶ αὐτὸν βασιλέα συνέπαινον γίνεσθαι."

Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἀρισταγόρης ὡς ταῦτα ἤκουσε, περιχαρὴς ἐὼν 32
ἀπήιε ἐς Μίλητον. ὁ δὲ Ἀρταφρένης, ὥς οἱ πέμψαντι ἐς Σοῦσα καὶ ὑπερθέντι τὰ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρισταγόρεω λεγόμενα συνέπαινος καὶ

---

invented, by Hekataios, cp. Bursian, *Geogr. v. Gr.* ii. 348. They were not reduced till 490 B.C., 6. 99 *infra*; there was still therefore a field open to the ambition of the Naxians.

31. 3. **μεγάθεϊ.** Naxos is the largest of the Kyklades, 75 R. miles in circumference, 19 miles long by 15 at the broadest points. On its size, beauty and fertility see article in Smith, *Dict. of Geogr.*, Tozer, *Islands of the Aegean*, c. iv., Bent, *Cyclades*, c. xiv., Bursian, *Geogr. v. Griechenl.* ii. 489 ff., Lolling in Müller's *Handbuch*, iii. 208.

ἀγχοῦ. The distance of Naxos from Miletos is about 100 E. miles in a bee-line. It is a convenient half-way station between Ionia and the Hellenic mainland.

4. **χρήματα . . ἀνδράποδα.** Aristagoras wisely omits the 8000 shields! "From the 8000 hoplites we may conclude that the free population amounted to 50,000 souls, to which number we may add at least as many slaves," *Dict. of Geogr.* Perhaps Artaphrenes would regard all the population as potentially slaves.

6. **ἐστι ἕτοιμα παρ' ἐμοί,** 'already lodged with me.'

9. **τὰς ἐκ ταύτης ἠρτημένας.** Primarily a geographical expression, but has a political suggestion in it.

12. **οὐκ ἐλάσσονι Κύπρου.** Kypros is nearly thrice as large as Euboia, but the exact area of these islands, respectively, is not easy to ascertain. Strabo gives the circuit of Kypros as 3420 stadia (p. 682) (say 425 R. miles). He does not give the circuit of Euboia, but estimates its greatest length at 1200 stades and its greatest breadth at 150 (p. 444). For modern estimates and literature, cp. Lolling, *op. c. supra*, pp. 190 ff. 273 ff.

κάρτα εὐπετέι αἱρεθῆναι might be an inference, not wholly unjust, from the fate of Euboia at the hands of the Athenians, cp. c. 77 *infra*, or the Persians themselves 6. 99-101, 8. 20, 23.

17. **ἅμα τῷ ἔαρι.** The visit of Aristagoras to Sardes would be just a year before his visit to Sparta, c. 38 *infra*. Cp. Appendix V.

αὐτὸς Δαρεῖος ἐγένετο, παρεσκευάσατο μὲν διηκοσίας τριήρεας, πολλὸν δὲ κάρτα ὅμιλον Περσέων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων, στρατηγὸν δὲ τούτων ἀπέδεξε Μεγαβάτην ἄνδρα Πέρσην τῶν Ἀχαιμενιδέων, ἑωυτοῦ τε καὶ Δαρείου ἀνεψιόν, τοῦ Παυσανίης ὁ Κλεομβρότου Λακεδαιμόνιος, εἰ δὴ ἀληθής γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος, ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ τούτων ἡρμόσατο θυγατέρα, ἔρωτα σχὼν τῆς Ἑλλάδος τύραννος γενέσθαι. ἀποδέξας δὲ Μεγαβάτην στρατηγὸν Ἀρταφρένης ἀπέστειλε τὸν στρατὸν παρὰ τὸν Ἀρισταγόρεα.
33 παραλαβὼν δὲ ὁ Μεγαβάτης τόν τε Ἀρισταγόρεα ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου καὶ τὴν Ἰάδα στρατιὴν καὶ τοὺς Ναξίους ἔπλεε πρόφασιν ἐπ᾽ Ἑλλησπόντου, ἐπείτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐν Χίῳ, ἔσχε τὰς νέας ἐς Καύ-

---

32. 4. αὐτὸς Δαρεῖος. Cp. 4. 1. What interval must be allowed for the communications between Sardes and Susa? (cp. c. 108 *infra*). At any rate the ships were to be ready *ἅμα τῷ ἔαρι*.

τριήρεας. The 200 triremes were presumably levied from the Greeks. The number of the Greek fleet at Lade was 353, 6. 8, and from the list there given it is obvious that Miletos, Samos, Chios and Lesbos might easily have supplied the whole number on this occasion. That the levy was more general is however shown by the anecdote which follows in c. 33.

5. **ἄλλων.** Other than Greek? or simply 'allies as well.' Cp. 4. 191.

6. **στρατηγὸν τούτων.** Otanes has nothing to say to the expedition. The exact authority of Megabates is in the story represented as ill-defined—*Hinc illae lacrymae.*

7. **Παυσανίης.** In this interesting reference we have another question in debate between Hdt. and Thucydides. Cp. Thuc. 1. 128. The chief points of difference are two: (1) The story in Hdt. represents Pausanias as a suitor for the daughter of Megabates. Thucydides represents the lady in question as a daughter of Xerxes: in Thuc. Megabates does indeed figure, as satrap of Phrygia, while Pausanias was at Byzantion, and is by Xerxes removed and replaced by Artabazos, in order that negotiations may be the better conducted. This looks remarkably like a Thucydidean correction of the tradition preserved to us by Hdt. (2) Hdt. expresses a doubt as to the truth of the story (*εἰ δὴ ἀληθής γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος*). Thucydides bases his version upon the apparently irrefutable evidence of Pausanias' own correspondence. Hdt. has here perhaps simply oral tradition to rely on, and he is undoubtedly tender of the fame of Pausanias. Cp. 9. 64. But had Thucydides really genuine documents?

9. **ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ τούτων.** A vague and almost superfluous chronological indication if by *ταῦτα* be understood simply the Naxian affair. The age of Megabates makes it perhaps additionally unlikely that it was his daughter whom Pausanias sought in marriage. But such points do not strike Hdt. (Cp. 3. 1.)

ἔρωτα. Pausanias' love was not for the lady but for the throne. There is humour in this, cp. 6. 129. Was Pausanias already married? Cp. Thuc. 5. 16.

τῆς Ἑλλάδος τύραννος. A remarkable expression. The political unity of Hellas could only have been realised under a monarchy, and only at Sparta could a Panhellenic monarchy have been established. But it would have been established, like the Roman principate afterwards, upon the ruins of the republican oligarchy. Upon a small scale the problem of empire was more than once presented to Sparta, as on a larger to Rome. Sparta clung to her domestic institutions, and forewent a Panhellenic unity. Rome accepted the imperial destiny, and discovered too late that it involved the tyrannis. (Cp. c. 3 *supra*.) On 'Hellas' cp. c. 49 *infra*.

33. 2. τὴν Ἰάδα στρατιήν. Apparently distinct from the *ὅμιλος Περσέων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων*. Still Megabates is represented as commander-in-chief.

πρόφασιν, adverbial accusative, cp. 4. 136.

κασα, ὡς ἐνθεῦτεν βορέῃ ἀνέμῳ ἐς τὴν Νάξον διαβάλοι. καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἔδεε τούτῳ τῷ στόλῳ Ναξίους ἀπολέσθαι, πρῆγμα τοιόνδε συνηνείχθη γενέσθαι. περιόντος Μεγαβάτεω τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν φυλακάς, ἐπὶ νεὸς Μυνδίης ἔτυχε οὐδεὶς φυλάσσων· ὁ δὲ δεινόν τι ποιησάμενος ἐκέλευσε τοὺς δορυφόρους ἐξευρόντας τὸν ἄρχοντα ταύτης τῆς νεός, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Σκύλαξ, τοῦτον δῆσαι διὰ θαλαμίης διελόντας τῆς νεὸς κατὰ τοῦτο, ἔξω μὲν κεφαλὴν ποιεῦντας ἔσω δὲ τὸ σῶμα. δεθέντος δὲ τοῦ Σκύλακος, ἐξαγγέλλει τις τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ ὅτι τὸν ξεῖνόν οἱ τὸν Μύνδιον Μεγαβάτης δήσας λυμαίνοιτο. ὁ δ' ἐλθὼν παραιτέετο τὸν Πέρσην, τυγχάνων δὲ οὐδενὸς τῶν ἐδέετο, αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν ἔλυσε. πυθόμενος δὲ κάρτα δεινὸν ἐποιήσατο ὁ Μεγαβάτης καὶ ἐσπέρχετο τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ. ὁ δὲ εἶπε "σοὶ δὲ καὶ τούτοισι τοῖσι πρήγμασι τί ἐστι; οὐ σὲ ἀπέστειλε Ἀρταφρένης ἐμέο πείθεσθαι καὶ πλέειν τῇ ἂν ἐγὼ κελεύω; τί πολλὰ πρήσσεις;" ταῦτα εἶπε ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης. ὁ δὲ θυμωθεὶς τούτοισι, ὡς νὺξ ἐγένετο, ἔπεμπε ἐς Νάξον πλοίῳ ἄνδρας φρά-

---

3. **Καύκασα** is placed by Kiepert's *Atlas* on the S.E. of Chios, looking towards the mainland: presumably on the strength of this passage.

4. **διαβάλοι**, nautical term. Cp. c. 34 *infra* *διέβαλον τὰς νέας.*

οὐ γὰρ ἔδεε. See Introduction, p. cxvi., and c. 28 *supra*, 6. 64 *infra*.

5. **τούτῳ τῷ στόλῳ.** The ruin of Naxos was accomplished by the next expedition, cp. 6. 96.

6. **περιόντος.** Megabates appears an active commander bent upon the success of his mission.

7. **Μυνδίης.** Myndos, not mentioned elsewhere by Hdt., was situated near Halikarnassos, and, like the latter, a colony from Troezen (Pausan. 2. 30, 8), though not a member of the Dorian Hexapolis (1. 144) but to be included in the *πρόσοικοι* there referred to.

Skylax though merely the *ἄρχων* of a single Myndian trireme must have been a considerable person, if he was really on terms of *ξεινίη* with Aristagoras. Skylax appears to be a local (Karian) name. Cp. 4. 44.

11. **τὸ σῶμα.** Van Herwerden cps. 7. 107 *κάρη δὲ τὸ σῶμα σαώσει.*

12. **δήσας λυμαίνοιτο**, not a case where *cessante causa cessat et effectus*, though at this stage the man was still in bonds.

13. **ἐλθών**, (1) to head quarters, (2) to the ship.

παραιτέετο. N.B. the imperfect. His suit was unsuccessful, cp. c. 22 *supra*.

19. **ὡς νὺξ ἐγένετο.** Cp. *Ephesians* 4. 26 *ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν.* Perhaps a Pythagorean maxim, cp. Plutarch, *Mor.* 488 quoted by Alford, *Gk. Test.* iii.[4] p. 125. Three stages are indicated in the feeling of Megabates (i) *δεινόν τι ποιησάμενος* . . (ii) *κάρτα δεινὸν ἐποιήσατο καὶ ἐσπέρχετο* . . (iii) *θυμωθείς*. It can hardly be said that his action in the first two stages was surprising or culpable. In the third stage, however, this Persian Grandee, of the blood of the Achaemenids, commander-in-chief of the expedition, stultifies his commission, betrays the king's interest, ruins a project which had the king's own express sanction, disappoints the satrap of Sardes, and prepares a discredit for himself, in order to gratify a passionate pique with the vice-governor of a single Greek city, who was insolent. Is this likely? Cp. Duncker, *Gesch. des A.* vii.[5] p. 34 (1882). If the act of treachery had been put down to Skylax, or to Aristagoras, it would have seemed more credible. Perhaps the Greek tradition preferred to assign the failure to the foreign foe. It is to be remembered that this traitor Megabates is in high favour afterwards (c. 32 *supra*), although this story of his treachery was presumably notorious—if true.

34 σοντας τοῖσι Ναξίοισι πάντα τὰ παρεόντα σφι πρήγματα. οἱ
γὰρ ὦν Νάξιοι οὐδὲν πάντως προσεδέκοντο ἐπὶ σφέας τὸν στόλον
τοῦτον ὁρμήσεσθαι. ἐπεὶ μέντοι ἐπύθοντο, αὐτίκα μὲν ἐσηνεί-
καντο τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἐς τὸ τεῖχος, παρεσκευάσαντο δὲ ὡς
πολιορκησόμενοι καὶ σῖτα καὶ ποτά, καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἐσάξαντο.
καὶ οὗτοι μὲν παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς παρεσομένου σφι πολέμου· οἱ
δ' ἐπείτε διέβαλον ἐκ τῆς Χίου τὰς νέας ἐς τὴν Νάξον, πρὸς
πεφραγμένους προσεφέροντο καὶ ἐπολιόρκεον μῆνας τέσσερας.
ὡς δὲ τά τε ἔχοντες ἦλθον χρήματα οἱ Πέρσαι, ταῦτα κατεδεδα-
πάνητό σφι, καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ προσαναισίμωτο πολλά,
τοῦ πλεῦνός τε ἐδέετο ἡ πολιορκίη, ἐνθαῦτα τείχεα τοῖσι φυγάσι
τῶν Ναξίων οἰκοδομήσαντες ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς τὴν ἤπειρον κακῶς
35 πρήσσοντες. Ἀρισταγόρης δὲ οὐκ εἶχε τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῷ Ἀρ-
ταφρένεϊ ἐκτελέσαι· ἅμα δὲ ἐπίεζέ μιν ἡ δαπάνη τῆς στρατιῆς
ἀπαιτεομένη, ἀρρώδεέ τε τοῦ στρατοῦ πρήξαντος κακῶς καὶ
Μεγαβάτῃ διαβεβλημένος, ἐδόκεέ τε τὴν βασιληίην τῆς Μιλήτου
ἀπαιρεθήσεσθαι. ἀρρωδέων δὲ τούτων ἕκαστα ἐβουλεύετο ἀπό-
στασιν· συνέπιπτε γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἐστιγμένον τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπῖχθαι
ἐκ Σούσων παρὰ Ἱστιαίου, σημαίνοντα ἀπίστασθαι Ἀρισταγόρην
ἀπὸ βασιλέος. ὁ γὰρ Ἱστιαῖος βουλόμενος τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ
σημῆναι ἀποστῆναι ἄλλως μὲν οὐδαμῶς εἶχε ἀσφαλέως σημῆναι
ὥστε φυλασσομενέων τῶν ὁδῶν, ὁ δὲ τῶν δούλων τὸν πιστότατον

---

34. 2. **οὐδέν.** Krüger adds *τι* which v. Herwerden admits. The Naxians are represented as little better than simpletons, paying no heed to the intrigues of their exiled fellow-citizens abroad, suspecting nothing of the two hundred triremes at Miletos, taking no thought of the fate of Samos, Chios, Lesbos, Lemnos; yet able withal on the shortest notice to make all things ready for a siege. These improbabilities are necessary to the story of Megabates' treachery.

5. **ἐσάξαντο** from *σάττεσθαι*. Schweig. reads *ποτὰ τὸ τεῖχος ἐσάξαντο i.e. ἐς τὸ τ. ἄξαντο.* Herwerden adopts *ἐφράξαντο* from Höger.

8. **μῆνας τέσσερας** would carry them over most of the summer; looks like a genuine memory, but does not make the improvisation of the Naxians more probable, nor consequently, the story of the treachery of Megabates.

10. **προσαναισίμωτο πολλά.** Aristagoras being genuinely in earnest in the undertaking, the failure of which Megabates had secured beforehand! On what terms the two were with each other during the four months' siege, it would be interesting to know.

35. 1. **τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν**, c. 31 *supra*. The only actual promise Aristagoras made to Artaphrenes was to find supplies. The suggestion seemed to be that Artaphrenes should himself undertake the annexation.

4. **Μεγαβάτῃ διαβεβλημένος.** We are left to suppose that the treachery of Megabates was not discovered till long afterwards, and even then not reported to the Persian court, otherwise he could hardly have been satrap of Daskyleion in 476 B.C., cp. c. 32 *supra*.

There are almost too many (five) good reasons here! Probably the message of Histiaios would have been enough to account for the revolt. This indeed was the view taken by Artaphrenes, who exonerated Aristagoras, 6. 1.

6. **τὸν ἐστιγμένον** referred to apparently a notorious personage, like "the man in the iron mask," etc. There seems truth in the tale.

10. **ὁ δέ**, 'so he . . .'

ἀποξυρήσας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔστιξε καὶ ἀνέμεινε ἀναφῦναι τὰς τρίχας, ὡς δὲ ἀνέφυσαν τάχιστα, ἀπέπεμπε ἐς Μίλητον ἐντειλάμενος αὐτῷ ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀπίκηται ἐς Μίλητον, κελεύειν Ἀρισταγόρην ξυρήσαντά μιν τὰς τρίχας κατιδέσθαι ἐς τὴν κεφαλήν. τὰ δὲ στίγματα ἐσήμαινε, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται, ἀπόστασιν. ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ἱστιαῖος ἐποίεε συμφορὴν ποιεύμενος μεγάλην τὴν ἑωυτοῦ κατοχὴν τὴν ἐν Σούσοισι· ἀποστάσιος ὦν γινομένης πολλὰς εἶχε ἐλπίδας μετήσεσθαι ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, μὴ δὲ νεώτερόν τι ποιεύσης τῆς Μιλήτου οὐδαμὰ ἐς αὐτὴν ἥξειν ἔτι ἐλογίζετο.

Ἱστιαῖος μέν νυν ταῦτα διανοεύμενος ἀπέπεμπε τὸν ἄγγελον, 36
Ἀρισταγόρῃ δὲ συνέπιπτε τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρόνου πάντα ταῦτα συνελθόντα. ἐβουλεύετο ὦν μετὰ τῶν στασιωτέων, ἐκφήνας τήν τε ἑωυτοῦ γνώμην καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Ἱστιαίου ἀπιγμένα. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι πάντες γνώμην κατὰ τὠυτὸ ἐξεφέροντο, κελεύοντες ἀπίστασθαι· Ἑκαταῖος δ' ὁ λογοποιὸς πρῶτα μὲν οὐκ ἔα πόλεμον βασιλέι τῶν Περσέων ἀναιρέεσθαι, καταλέγων τά τε ἔθνεα πάντα τῶν ἦρχε Δαρεῖος καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ. ἐπείτε δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθε, δεύτερα συνεβούλευε ποιέειν ὅκως ναυκρατέες τῆς θαλάσσης ἔσονται. ἄλλως μέν νυν οὐδαμῶς ἔφη λέγων ἐνορᾶν ἐσόμενον τοῦτο· ἐπίστασθαι γὰρ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν Μιλησίων ἐοῦσαν ἀσθενέα· εἰ δὲ τὰ χρήματα καταιρεθείη τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἱροῦ τοῦ ἐν Βραγχίδῃσι, τὰ Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδὸς ἀνέθηκε, πολλὰς εἶχε ἐλπίδας

---

11. **ἔστιξε,** with his own hand? probably. The letters were not branded but tattooed (τὸ μὲν ἐστίχθαι κτλ. c. 6 *supra*). Histiaios may have learnt the art in Thrace. Aulus Gellius who tells the story (17. 9 *ad fin.*) with some (worthless) variations, from a different source, seems to imagine that the communication was a lengthy one. Demaratos was credited with a different method of sending a dangerous message 7. 239 (cp. c. 92 *infra*).

16. **ἀπόστασιν.** Perhaps this single word was all that was on the man's skin. However Polyainos 1. 24 knows better, Ἱστιαῖος Ἀρισταγόρᾳ· Ἰωνίαν ἀπόστησον.

18. **πολλὰς εἶχε ἐλπίδας,** c. 30 *supra*. The Nostalgy of Greek exiles is most fully exemplified in the story of Demokedes, 3. 129 ff. The case of Histiaios was not one of simple home-sickness: better to reign in Miletos than serve in Susa.

36. 2. **πάντα ταῦτα.** The five sufficient reasons enumerated c. 35 *supra*.

6. **ὁ λογοποιός.** Cp. c. 125 *infra*, 6. 137, and Introduction, p. lxvii. Hekataios is one of the tyrant's partisans. This circumstance would not recommend him to Hdt., nor yet his sacrilegious advice *infra*. Perhaps Hdt. (*pace* his own recorded experience) did not approve of historians meddling with politics.

7. **καταλέγων.** Was this catalogue by Hekataios not committed to writing, included in any of his works known to Hdt. and used by him, *e.g.* in 3. 90 ff., 7. 61 ff. *et al.*? cp. 4. 87.

Hekataios the prose-wright is at first in despair and then full of hope, his hopes being bound up with a counsel of despair, if not of impiety. However, he had reason, for the historic offerings at Branchidae apparently suffered the fate he prophesied, cp. 6. 19. Hence the rather ἦν just below.

13. **Βραγχίδῃσι,** *αἱ Βραγχίδαι* the place, Didyma, 6. 19 *infra*; *οἱ Βραγχίδαι*, cp. 1. 158, the priests and custodians, 'Sons of Branchos,' first founder. Strabo, 634.

τὰ Κροῖσος κτλ. 1. 92.

πολλὰς εἶχε ἐλπίδας. Here from

ἐπικρατήσειν τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ οὕτω αὐτούς τε ἕξειν τοῖσι
χρήμασι χρᾶσθαι καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους οὐ συλήσειν αὐτά. τὰ δὲ
χρήματα ἦν ταῦτα μεγάλα, ὡς δεδήλωταί μοι ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν
λόγων. αὕτη μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἐνίκα ἡ γνώμη, ἐδόκεε δὲ ὅμως ἀπί-
στασθαι, ἕνα τε αὐτῶν πλώσαντα ἐς Μυοῦντα ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον
τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Νάξου ἀπελθόν, ἐὸν ἐνθαῦτα, συλλαμβάνειν πειρᾶσθαι
37 *τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν ἐπιπλέοντας στρατηγούς. ἀποπεμφθέντος δὲ*
Ἰητραγόρεω κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ συλλαβόντος δόλῳ Ὀλίατον
Ἰβανώλλιος Μυλασσέα καὶ Ἱστιαῖον Τύμνεω Τερμερέα καὶ Κώην
Ἐρξάνδρου, τῷ Δαρεῖος Μυτιλήνην ἐδωρήσατο, καὶ Ἀρισταγόρην
Ἡρακλείδεω Κυμαῖον καὶ ἄλλους συχνούς, οὕτω δὴ ἐκ τοῦ
ἐμφανέος ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἀπεστήκεε, πᾶν ἐπὶ Δαρείῳ μηχανώ-
μενος. καὶ πρῶτα μὲν λόγῳ μετεὶς τὴν τυραννίδα ἰσονομίην
ἐποίεε τῇ Μιλήτῳ, ὡς ἂν ἑκόντες αὐτῷ οἱ Μιλήσιοι συναπι-
σταίατο, μετὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἄλλῃ Ἰωνίῃ τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίεε, τοὺς
μὲν ἐξελαύνων τῶν τυράννων, τοὺς δ' ἔλαβε τυράννους ἀπὸ τῶν

---

the mouth or pen of Hekataios. Cp. cc. 30, 35 *supra*.

16. **ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν λόγων**, 1. 92. A remarkable expression, the authenticity of which there is little reason to question. Had the words been a gloss, the reference would probably have been still more explicit. *ὁ πρῶτος τῶν λόγων* can scarcely be identified with the whole of Bk. 1 (notwithstanding the use of *ὁ λόγος* in 1. 95), but may be taken to cover cc. 1-94, or the first of the two divisions into which Bk. 1 clearly falls. *ἐν τοῖς Λυδίοισι λόγοισι* would have been an expression more in accord with Herodotean phraseology, cp. 1. 184, 2. 161. The employment of the ordinal number here is, however, specially interesting in its bearing on the question of the Composition of Hdt.'s work. See further, Introduction, §§ 2, 21.

18. **ἕνα . . πειρᾶσθαι.** He would have the assistance of his ship's crew at least: but he may have had all the ships of Miletos at his disposal. Myus was not ten miles distant, across the Latmian Bay. Its territory bordered on that of Priene, cp. 1. 142, and 6. 8.

37. 2. **Ἰητραγόρεω**, see c. 30 *supra*. What the *δόλος* was we are left to conjecture: nothing is more probable than a banquet.—*Oliatos*. An Herakleides son of Ibanollis of Mylassa appears c. 121 *infra*. The proper names sound 'Karian.'—*Mylassa* (or Mylasa, cp. Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* ii. 232), some 30 miles south of Myus. The Karian Zeus had a temple there 1. 171; cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 528, who mentions that "Mylasa was originally the residence of the dynasts of Caria until they obtained possession of the Greek town of Halikarnassos." Ramsay, *op. c.* p. 422, makes it the seat of a bishopric in Roman times (but cp. pp. 416, 417).—*Histiaios* was released, and must have been subsequently restored, cp. 7. 98, and apparently succeeded by a son named Tymnes. Cp. Head, *op. c.* p. 532. On Tymnes cp. 4. 76.—*Termera*. "A small place on the promontory between Halikarnassos and Myndus" (Head). "Termera was at Assarlik . . ." (Ramsay, p. 424).—*Koes*, 4. 97 and c. 11 *supra*, is a Lesbian (Aeolian).—*Aristagoras* son of Herakleides of Kyme, 4. 138, likewise an Aeolian.

The short list of tyrants arrested at Myus by Iatragoras, under orders from Aristagoras of Miletos, is not a little remarkable. It includes only four names. Two of these are apparently native Karian, or Helleno - Karian dynasts: two are Aeolian tyrants. No Ionian tyrant is mentioned. The anonymous *ἄλλοι συχνοί* remain anonymous to the end of the story.

7. **ἰσονομίην.** So Miletos follows suit to Naxos, as Naxos to Athens, c. 30 *supra*.

The *τυραννίς* was identified with 'medism' in the Ionian cities at this time. Cp. 4. 137.

νεῶν τῶν συμπλευσασέων ἐπὶ Νάξον, τούτους δὲ φίλα βουλόμενος
ποιέεσθαι τῇσι πόλισι ἐξεδίδου, ἄλλον ἐς ἄλλην πόλιν παραδιδούς,
ὅθεν εἴη ἕκαστος. Κώην μέν νυν Μυτιληναῖοι ἐπείτε τάχιστα 38
παρέλαβον, ἐξαγαγόντες κατέλευσαν, Κυμαῖοι δὲ τὸν σφέτερον
αὐτῶν ἀπῆκαν· ὣς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι οἱ πλεῦνες ἀπίεσαν. τυράννων
μέν νυν κατάπαυσις ἐγίνετο ἀνὰ τὰς πόλιας, Ἀρισταγόρης δὲ ὁ
Μιλήσιος ὡς τοὺς τυράννους κατέπαυσε, στρατηγοὺς ἐν ἑκάστῃ
τῶν πολίων κελεύσας ἑκάστους καταστῆσαι, δεύτερα αὐτὸς ἐς
Λακεδαίμονα τριήρεϊ ἀπόστολος ἐγίνετο· ἔδεε γὰρ δὴ συμμαχίης
τινός οἱ μεγάλης ἐξευρεθῆναι.

Τῆς δὲ Σπάρτης Ἀναξανδρίδης μὲν ὁ Λέοντος οὐκέτι περιεὼν 39
ἐβασίλευε ἀλλὰ ἐτετελευτήκεε, Κλεομένης δὲ ὁ Ἀναξανδρίδεω
εἶχε τὴν βασιληίην, οὐ κατ' ἀνδραγαθίην σχὼν ἀλλὰ κατὰ γένος.
Ἀναξανδρίδῃ γὰρ ἔχοντι γυναῖκα ἀδελφεῆς ἑωυτοῦ θυγατέρα, καὶ
ἐούσης ταύτης οἱ καταθυμίης, παῖδες οὐκ ἐγίνοντο. τούτου δὲ
τοιούτου ἐόντος, οἱ ἔφοροι εἶπαν ἐπικαλεσάμενοι αὐτὸν "εἴ τοι

---

38. 3. **ἀπίεσαν.** The tyrants presumably retired to Sardes. Perhaps they met Hippias there. At any rate Sigeion remained in his hands.

τυράννων . . κατάπαυσις. This might have been reckoned an *ἄνεσις κακῶν*, cp. c. 28 *supra*.

5. **στρατηγούς.** The precedent of Athens (c. 69 *infra*) may have been followed. However that may be, Strategi were wanted for the coming struggle with the Persians. The old title for the chief magistrate in the Ionian cities was perhaps *πρύτανις*, as at Miletos (Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 5, 8, 1305^a), where, however, the term may have been associated with the tyranny, owing to the circumstances referred to by Aristotle, *l.c.*

6. **δεύτερα.** The event is second in numerical order, but it is a distinct event, not a repetition of a former event. Cp. note on *τὸ δεύτερον*, c. 28 *supra*.

39. 1. **Σπάρτης.** The digression or excursus on Sparta is short (cc. 39-48), and biographical. The history of Sparta is more fully given as a 'function' of Athenian history, cc. 55-97 *infra*. Cp. Introduction, pp. xxxvi ff., and Appendix VII.

Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ Λέοντος. For the complete genealogy, see 7. 204.

οὐκέτι must be taken to refer back to 1. 67 (Anaxandrides was no longer King, for he was no longer alive) though Kleomenes has been mentioned already (3. 148) as king of Sparta. There is some awkwardness in the words *οὐκέτι περιεὼν ἐβασίλευε*: they seem to imply that Anaxandrides was king till his death. For the use of the negative Stein cps. Th. 1. 12 *ὥστε μὴ ἡσυχάσασαν αὐξηθῆναι.*

3. **τὴν βασιληίην**, 'the kingly office,' which, though no one would discover it from this passage, was dual or collegiate.

κατ' ἀνδραγαθίην, not Kleomenes but Dorieus would have been king c. 42 *infra*.

γένος = *πρεσβυγενηίην*, priority of birth.

4. **ἀδελφεῆς ἑωυτοῦ θυγατέρα**, consequently his own niece. Cp. case of Leonidas and Gorgo, 7. 239; Archidamos and Lampito, 6. 71.

6. **ἐπικαλεσάμενοι.** The five Ephors summon the leading king before them, as guardians of the Spartan Institutions. The extinction of one of the kingships might have led to the aggrandisement of the other. The Ephors would no doubt have been equally solicitous for the House of Prokles. Dual Royalty was a double safeguard against tyranny. Cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 9, 30, 1271^a. On the kingships cp. 6. 51 ff. Plutarch, *Kleom.* 10, reports that king as saying *μεταπεμπομένων τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ἐφόρων τὸ πρῶτον ἀντιλέγειν καὶ τὸ δεύτερον, τὸ δὲ τρίτον καλούντων ἀναστάντα βαδίζειν πρὸς αὐτούς*: a report which may preserve a genuine custom.

σὺ σεωυτοῦ μὴ προορᾷς, ἀλλ' ἡμῖν τοῦτ' ἐστὶ οὐ περιοπτέον, γένος τὸ Εὐρυσθένεος γενέσθαι ἐξίτηλον. σύ νυν τὴν μὲν ἔχεις γυναῖκα, ἐπείτε τοι οὐ τίκτει, ἔξεο, ἄλλην δὲ γῆμον· καὶ ποιέων ταῦτα Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἁδήσεις." ὁ δ' ἀμείβετο φὰς τούτων οὐδέτερα ποιήσειν, ἐκείνους τε οὐ καλῶς συμβουλεύειν παραινέοντας, τὴν ἔχει γυναῖκα ἐοῦσαν ἀναμάρτητον ἑωυτῷ, ταύτην ἀπέντα ἄλλην
40 ἐσαγαγέσθαι· οὐδέ σφι πείσεσθαι. πρὸς ταῦτα οἱ ἔφοροι καὶ οἱ γέροντες βουλευσάμενοι προσέφερον Ἀναξανδρίδῃ τάδε. "ἐπεὶ τοίνυν τοι περιεχόμενόν σε ὁρῶμεν τῆς ἔχεις γυναικός, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα ποίεε, καὶ μὴ ἀντίβαινε τούτοισι, ἵνα μή τι ἀλλοῖον περὶ σεῦ Σπαρτιῆται βουλεύσωνται· γυναικὸς μὲν τῆς ἔχεις οὐ προσδεόμεθά σευ τῆς ἐξέσιος, σὺ δὲ ταύτῃ τε πάντα ὅσα νῦν παρέχεις πάρεχε καὶ ἄλλην πρὸς ταύτῃ ἐσάγαγε γυναῖκα τεκνοποιόν." ταῦτά κῃ λεγόντων συνεχώρησε ὁ Ἀναξανδρίδης, μετὰ δὲ γυναῖκας ἔχων δύο διξὰς ἱστίας οἴκεε, ποιέων οὐδαμῶς Σπαρ-
41 τιητικά. χρόνου δὲ οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος ἡ ἐσύστερον ἐπελθοῦσα γυνὴ τίκτει τὸν δὴ Κλεομένεα τοῦτον. καὶ αὕτη τε ἔπεδρον βασιλέα Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἀπέφαινε, καὶ ἡ προτέρη γυνὴ τὸν πρότερον

---

8. **ἐξίτηλον**, a rare word, 1. 1. Is it to be supposed that the house of Eurysthenes had no cadet branches? Cp. c. 48 *infra*.

9. **ἔξεο**, Schäfer's emendation for ἐκσέο.

10. **Σπαρτιήτῃσι**, 'Freemen of Sparta': the citizen body, which might yet take action. See next chapter.

οὐδέτερα. Neither put away his wife, nor take another in place of her. He kept his word.

11. **συμβουλεύειν παραινέοντας**. The dictum of the Ephors was advice not command to the king.

τὴν ἔχει γυναῖκα, article for relative: repeated from τὴν μὲν ἔχεις *supra*. A variation produced in next chapter by attraction: τῆς ἔχεις.

40. 1. **οἱ ἔφοροι καὶ οἱ γέροντες**. Apparently, and for obvious reasons, a more authoritative appeal than that of the Ephors sole. What part the other king played, or how far the Ephors could combine thus with the Gerusia against the kings, cannot be determined from the present story. But cp. 6. 82 *infra*.

3. **σὺ δέ**, *in apodosi*, marks emphasis, perhaps excitement on the part of the Ephors.

4. **ἀλλοῖον** is a euphemism, or meiosis.

5. **Σπαρτιῆται**, in the Apella? There was still a trump to play.

9. **Σπαρτιητικά**. Such, we must suppose, was the general ignorance among the Greeks of Spartan usages, that the bigamy of Anaxandrides might have been mistaken for lawful custom, without this express *caveat*. E. Hruza, *Polygamie und Pellikat nach gr. Rechte*, pp. 60 f., questions whether there was any express prohibition. But at Sparta the rule might hold: ἃ δὲ μὴ κελεύει, ἀπαγορεύει, Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 5. 11, 1138 a.

41. 1. **οὐ πολλοῦ**. It is a wonder they did not question the paternity of Kleomenes as of Demaratos, *vid.* 6. 65. The year of his birth cannot be fixed. It might be about the date of the fall of Sardes (546 B.C.), in which case Kleomenes might have been upwards of 30 years of age, at the date of the application of Maiandrios 3. 148 (*circa* 516 B.C.). If, however, Kleomenes was on the throne in Sparta in 519 B.C. (Duncker, vi.[5] 550) and if the king's minority extended to the age of 30, he must have been born about 550 B.C. or earlier. Cp. 6. 108 *infra*.

3. **ἀπέφαινε**. Stein suggests ἀπέφηνε.

χρόνον ἄτοκος ἐοῦσα τότε κως ἐκύησε, συντυχίῃ ταύτῃ χρησαμένη. ἔχουσαν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀληθέι λόγῳ οἱ τῆς ἐπελθούσης γυναικὸς οἰκήιοι πυθόμενοι ὤχλεον, φάμενοι αὐτὴν κομπέειν ἄλλως βουλομένην ὑποβαλέσθαι. δεινὰ δὲ ποιεύντων αὐτῶν, τοῦ χρόνου συντάμνοντος, ὑπ᾽ ἀπιστίης οἱ ἔφοροι τίκτουσαν τὴν γυναῖκα περιιζόμενοι ἐφύλαξαν. ἡ δὲ ὡς ἔτεκε Δωριέα ἰθέως ἴσχει Λεωνίδην, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ἰθέως ἴσχει Κλεόμβροτον· οἱ δὲ καὶ διδύμους λέγουσι Κλεόμβροτον καὶ Λεωνίδην γενέσθαι. ἡ δὲ Κλεομένεα τεκοῦσα καὶ [τὸ] δεύτερον ἐπελθοῦσα γυνή, ἐοῦσα θυγάτηρ Πρινητάδεω τοῦ Δημαρμένου, οὐκέτι ἔτικτε τὸ δεύτερον.

Ὁ μὲν δὴ Κλεομένης, ὡς λέγεται, ἦν τε οὐ φρενήρης ἀκρομανής τε, ὁ δὲ Δωριεὺς ἦν τῶν ἡλίκων πάντων πρῶτος, εὖ 42
τε ἐπίστατο κατ᾽ ἀνδραγαθίην αὐτὸς σχήσων τὴν βασιληίην. ὥστε ὢν οὕτω φρονέων, ἐπειδὴ ὅ τε Ἀναξανδρίδης ἀπέθανε καὶ

---

5. **ἔχουσαν.** Cobet would read *κυέουσαν* or add *ἐν γαστρί* after λόγῳ. With ἀλ. λόγῳ cp. *τὴν ἀληθείην, τίς μευ ἐστὶ πατὴρ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ* 6. 68.

οἱ τῆς . . οἰκήιοι. Family interests and connexions counted for a good deal in Sparta, cp. 4. 149.

8. **οἱ ἔφοροι.** A fresh evidence of the care for the royal family entertained by the Ephors: not the same men of course as those alluded to cc. 39, 40.

9. **ἴσχει**, *concipit.*

10. **οἱ δὲ . . λέγουσι.** Hdt. would hardly have mentioned this view, if he thought there was nothing in it. His authorities then were good: perhaps Spartan. Conversely, Spartan tradition was not clear upon this point. Hdt. however seems to prefer the view put first, perhaps as better according with the succession of Leonidas.

12. **τὸ δεύτερον . . τὸ δεύτερον.** The awkwardness of this repetition is not greatly diminished by bracketing with Stein the first *τό*, though the grammar is improved; and *δεύτερον ἐπελθοῦσα* is tautologous. Holder follows Bötticher in bracketing *καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἐπελθοῦσα*. On *δεύτερον* cp. *δεύτερα* c. 38, *τὸ δεύτερον* c. 28. The difference made by the article is well shown in this passage, *δεύτερον ἐπελθοῦσα* applying to a single act by a different person: *τὸ δεύτερον ἔτικτε* to a repeated act by the same person. (Cobet brackets *γυνὴ* also.)

13. **Δημαρμένου.** Stein suggests that this Demarmenos was son of the famous Chilon, 1. 59, 6. 65. Blakesley suggests that the mother of Kleomenes was of Achaian not of Herakleid blood: "By his father's side Kleomenes was pure Dorian," and quotes the pedigree 7. 204. But Achaian and Herakleid are not opposed to each other. On the contrary, if Kleomenes had claims to Achaian descent (c. 72 *infra*) it was in virtue of his being an Herakleid.

42. 1. **ὡς λέγεται.** At Sparta? at Delphi? in the west? or by the family of Demaratos? (Cp. Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1, 6, *Anab.* 7. 8, 17, Pausan. 3. 7, 7.) Was Hdt. the first to commit the *Story of Dorieus* to writing?

ἦν τε οὐ φρενήρης ἀκρομανής τε. The position of the *τε* is remarkable. *οὐ-φρενήρης* coalesce into a single positive idea. One might have expected the statement to run that Kleomenes, who had never been quite 'right' (*οὐ-φρενήρης*) went at last utterly mad (*ἀκρομανής*). On his madness, see 6. 75.

2. **Δωριεύς.** The name is certainly significant, and its associations perhaps added point to the pun of Kleomenes, c. 72 *infra*.

πρῶτος, in merit. Cp. L. & S.[7] *sub voc.* I. 5. The use is obviously quite different in *τῷ πρώτῳ*, c. 22 *supra*.

3. **ἐπίστατο . . αὐτὸς σχήσων**, the common idiom. Cp. *γνώμη* c. 93 *η infra*.

κατ᾽ ἀνδραγαθίην, c. 39 *supra*.

4. **ἐπειδή**, *c.* 520 B.C.? The passage seems to imply that Kleomenes only succeeded on the death of this father.

οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι χρεώμενοι τῷ νόμῳ ἐστήσαντο βασιλέα τὸν πρεσ-
βύτατον Κλεομένεα, ὁ Δωριεὺς δεινόν τε ποιεύμενος καὶ οὐκ ἀξιῶν
ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος βασιλεύεσθαι, αἰτήσας λεὼν Σπαρτιήτας ἦγε ἐς
ἀποικίην, οὔτε τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι χρηστηρίῳ χρησάμενος ἐς ἥντινα
γῆν κτίσων ἴῃ, οὔτε ποιήσας οὐδὲν τῶν νομιζομένων· οἷα δὲ
βαρέως φέρων, ἀπίει ἐς τὴν Λιβύην τὰ πλοῖα· κατηγέοντο δέ οἱ
ἄνδρες Θηραῖοι. ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐς Λιβύην οἴκισε χῶρον κάλλι-
στον τῶν Λιβύων παρὰ Κίνυπα ποταμόν. ἐξελασθεὶς δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν
τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ ὑπὸ Μακέων τε Λιβύων καὶ Καρχηδονίων ἀπίκετο ἐς
43 Πελοπόννησον. ἐνθαῦτα δέ οἱ Ἀντιχάρης ἀνὴρ Ἐλεώνιος συνε-
βούλευσε ἐκ τῶν Λαΐου χρησμῶν Ἡρακλείην τὴν ἐν Σικελίῃ
κτίζειν, φὰς τὴν Ἔρυκος χώρην πᾶσαν εἶναι Ἡρακλειδέων αὐτοῦ

---

5. **οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . ἐστήσαντο βασιλέα.** Some election or ratification (as it were a *lex de imperio*) seems to be implied: cp. Thuc. 5. 16 *ad f.* Hdt. seems to use the terms Λακεδαιμόνιοι and Σπαρτιῆται as equivalent. Cp. G. Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsa.* i.[2] 41, where, however, the statement that in Thuc. 1. 128-134 we find an exception to the strict use of the later historians appears to me incorrect.

τῷ νόμῳ. If the *φάτις* 7. 3 is to be trusted this *νόμος* was not unqualified. The description of the merit and the mind of Dorieus seems to imply that the claim of primogeniture might have been set aside, at least in the case of imbecility or insanity.

7. **Σπαρτιήτας.** Not in apposition to λεὼν but acc. after *αἰτήσας* (*αἰτεῖν τινά τι* common). The *Oikists* may all have been Dorians or at least leading citizens c. 46 *infra*, though citizens could ill be spared from Sparta in any great number. Cp. the restrictions on *ἀποδημία*. Harpocration: *καὶ γὰρ τὸ μηδένα τῶν μαχίμων ἄνευ τῆς τῶν ἀρχόντων γνώμης ἀποδημεῖν, κτλ.* V. Rose, *Aristot. Frag.*[2] 543.

8. **ἐν Δελφοῖσι.** This bad example was, we may suspect, well remembered in Delphi together with the failure of Dorieus. The claim here advanced on behalf of Delphi has sometimes been exaggerated into an historical record (*e.g.* "almost all Greek colonies were founded with the sanction and frequently by the express command of the Pythian Apollo" *Dict. Geogr.* i. 726). Cicero's question is better: quam vero Graecia coloniam misit in Aeoliam Ioniam Asiam Siciliam Italiam sine Pythio aut Dodonaeo aut Hammonis oraculo? *de Divin.* 1. 1, 3.

9. **τῶν νομιζομένων.** The conduct reported of Dorieus hardly bears out the praise bestowed upon him. To set religion and law at defiance is hardly good evidence of virtue and wisdom. Had Delphi, as well as Spartan *νόμος*, already decided against him?

10. **Λιβύην.** He knew apparently what he was about, had a definite goal, and chose his guides wisely, cp. 4. 150 ff. That he omitted to obtain Delphic approval of a mission to Libya is the more remarkable considering the relations between Delphi and Kyrene (4, *l. c. supra*). Perhaps Delphi would have urged a site too far west, cp. 4. 178.

11. **χῶρον κάλλιστον τῶν Λιβύων παρὰ Κίνυπα,** 4. 175, 198. He was not working against, or apparently with, the Kyrenaeans.

13. **τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ,** 'after two years.' (Not *drei Jahre hindurch*, Duncker, vi.[5] 559.)

Μακέων, 4. 175. The native and Semitic opposition to a fresh Greek settlement is significant.

43. 1. **Ἐλεώνιος,** from Eleon in Boeotia (*Il.* 2. 500). Strabo 405 places Heleon (*sic*) near Tanagra. Cp. Bursian, *Geogr. Gr.* i. 223.

2. **Λαΐου χρησμῶν.** One of the collections of oracles that were coming into fashion. Cp. 7. 6, 8. 20 *et al.* and Introduction, p. lxxxv.

Ἡρακλείην. There never was an Herakleia on Mount Eryx: but the Herakleid legend was located there. Cp. Freeman, *Sicily*, i. 209 ff., ii. 86 ff. Stein suggests that *γῆν* has dropped out, and would read: *Ἡρακλέην γῆν τὴν*.

3. **φάς.** On the character of this claim and argument cp. 4. 8. A Boeotian

Ἡρακλέος κτησαμένου. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα ἐς Δελφοὺς οἴχετο
χρησόμενος τῷ χρηστηρίῳ, εἰ αἱρέει ἐπ᾽ ἣν στέλλεται χώρην· ἡ
δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ αἱρήσειν. παραλαβὼν δὲ Δωριεὺς τὸν στόλον
τὸν καὶ ἐς Λιβύην ἦγε, ἐκομίζετο παρὰ τὴν Ἰταλίην. τὸν χρόνον 44
δὲ τοῦτον, ὡς λέγουσι Συβαρῖται, σφέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ Τῆλυν τὸν
ἑωυτῶν βασιλέα ἐπὶ Κρότωνα μέλλειν στρατεύεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ
Κροτωνιήτας περιδεέας γενομένους δεηθῆναι Δωριέος σφίσι τιμω-
ρῆσαι καὶ τυχεῖν δεηθέντας. συστρατεύεσθαί τε δὴ ἐπὶ Σύβαριν
Δωριέα καὶ συνελεῖν τὴν Σύβαριν. ταῦτα μέν νυν Συβαρῖται
λέγουσι ποιῆσαι Δωριέα τε καὶ τοὺς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, Κροτωνιῆται δὲ
οὐδένα σφίσι φασὶ ξεῖνον προσεπιλαβέσθαι τοῦ πρὸς Συβαρίτας
πολέμου εἰ μὴ Καλλίην τῶν Ἰαμιδέων μάντιν Ἠλεῖον μοῦνον, καὶ
τοῦτον τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· παρὰ Τήλυος τοῦ Συβαριτέων τυράννου
ἀποδράντα ἀπικέσθαι παρὰ σφέας, ἐπείτε οἱ τὰ ἱρὰ οὐ προεχώρεε
χρηστὰ θυομένῳ ἐπὶ Κρότωνα. ταῦτα δὲ οὗτοι λέγουσι. μαρ- 45
τύρια δὲ τούτων ἑκάτεροι ἀποδεικνύουσι τάδε, Συβαρῖται μὲν

---

seer is represented as the author of this far-reaching argument. Herakles was at home in Boeotia (c. 59 *infra*, 6. 53), but to have admitted that (Spartan) Herakleids were entitled to all the settlements of Herakles would have involved an ecumenical *γῆς ἀναδασμός*.

6. **αἱρήσειν.** He does not ask this time either, *ἐς ἥντινα γῆν κτίσων ἴῃ*. It was not Apollo, it was the Oidipodeian seer that sent him to Sicily. The Pythia responds in the indicative not in the imperative. The ironic prophecy is fulfilled: Dorieus obtained the place to which he was going, verily his own place. Freeman's misgivings (*Sicily*, ii. 87 *n.*) are beside the point.

44. 1. **τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον.** Dorieus had been two years in Libya (c. 42), the destruction of Sybaris took place 510 B.C. Diodoros 12. 9.

2. **ὡς λέγουσι Συβαρῖται.** We are here plainly notified of the source of this part of the story: and though it does not follow that Hdt. himself had the story by word of mouth from men of Sybaris, and from men of Kroton, much less that he forgathered with them in their proper homes (see Introduction, pp. lxxvii f.), still the presumption created by the tone and style of the passage is in favour of some such hypothesis. The 'Sybaritae' here named can only be the remnant or posterity of the inhabitants of the old Sybaris, who occupied Laos and Skidros 510-453 B.C. (6. 21) till they were transferred or restored to 'Sybaris' 453-448 B.C., and afterwards to Thurii (by the Athenians) c. 443 B.C. Cp. B. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 70.

3. **ἐπί.** For the full story, Diodor. 12. 9, Duncker vi.[5] 639 ff., Lenormant, *La Grande-Grèce*, i. 293 ff. As they are here called 'Sybaritae' it might be argued that this passage was first written down either during the six years 453-448 B.C., or after their expulsion from Thurii. But the remnant of 'Sybaritae' seems to have held so closely together all along that the historian might have described them as Sybaritae even when inhabitants of Thurii. The Sybarites and their 'king' Telys are represented as the aggressors, and the men of Kroton are terrified (*περιδεέας*). The value of a Spartan was not to be reckoned by the numbers he brought with him, as the notorious cases of Salaithos, Brasidas, Gylippos, *et al.* afterwards showed. Elis was a home of mantic, cp. 9. 33 and 37, and the Iamidae were the greatest of the mantic families: *πολύκλειτον καθ᾽ Ἕλλανας γένος Ἰαμιδᾶν* Pind. *Ol.* 6. 71.

10. **τυράννου.** The Sybarites used the more complimentary term *βασιλεύς*.

45. 1. **μαρτύρια.** Duncker (vi.[5] 641) decides emphatically for the Sybarite contention, Freeman (*Sicily*, ii. 91) inclines in the same direction: but is it so

τέμενός τε καὶ νηὸν ἐόντα παρὰ τὸν ξηρὸν Κρᾶθιν, τὸν ἱδρύσασθαι συνελόντα τὴν πόλιν Δωριέα λέγουσι Ἀθηναίῃ ἐπωνύμῳ Κραθίῃ· τοῦτο δὲ αὐτοῦ Δωριέος τὸν θάνατον μαρτύριον μέγιστον ποιεῦνται, ὅτι παρὰ τὰ μεμαντευμένα ποιέων διεφθάρη· εἰ γὰρ δὴ μὴ παρέπρηξε μηδέν, ἐπ᾽ ὃ δὲ ἐστάλη ἐποίεε, εἷλε ἂν τὴν Ἐρυκίνην χώρην καὶ ἑλὼν κατέσχε, οὐδ᾽ ἂν αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ στρατιὴ διεφθάρη. οἱ δ᾽ αὖ Κροτωνιῆται ἀποδεικνῦσι Καλλίῃ μὲν τῷ Ἠλείῳ ἐξαίρετα ἐν γῇ τῇ Κροτωνιήτιδι πολλὰ δοθέντα, τὰ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι ἐνέμοντο οἱ Καλλίεω ἀπόγονοι, Δωριέι δὲ καὶ τοῖσι Δωριέος ἀπογόνοισι οὐδέν. καίτοι εἰ συνεπελάβετό γε τοῦ Συβαριτικοῦ πολέμου Δωριεύς, δοθῆναι ἄν οἱ πολλαπλήσια ἢ Καλλίῃ. ταῦτα μέν νυν ἑκάτεροι αὐτῶν μαρτύρια ἀποφαίνονται, καὶ πάρεστι, ὁκοτέροισί τις πείθεται αὐτῶν, τούτοισι προσχωρέειν.

46 Συνέπλεον δὲ Δωριέι καὶ ἄλλοι συγκτίσται Σπαρτιητέων, Θεσσαλὸς καὶ Παραιβάτης καὶ Κελέης καὶ Εὐρυλέων· οἳ ἐπείτε ἀπίκοντο παντὶ στόλῳ ἐς τὴν Σικελίην, ἀπέθανον μάχῃ ἑσσωθέντες ὑπό τε Φοινίκων καὶ Ἐγεσταίων· μοῦνος δὲ Εὐρυλέων τῶν

---

clear that the Sybarites, when it came to evidence, have the best of the argument? (1) They asserted that Dorieus founded the temple and precinct on the Krathis to Athene Krathia, but perhaps the assertion was not true (λέγουσι, cp. 4. 187). Even if that assertion was true, it did not prove that Dorieus had joined in the destruction of Sybaris. (2) Still less did the premature death of Dorieus (*μαρτύριον μέγιστον*) prove their point. (3) The *onus probandi* lay with the Sybarites. (4) The motive for ascribing the destruction of Sybaris to Dorieus rather than to the men of Kroton is obvious. (5) The argument of the Krotoniates though not absolutely final is no sophism. If a man of the Herakleid stock of Sparta had lent them his aid, he would have claimed and obtained his reward. It might be said that the temple dedicated to Athene was out of his share of the spoil. But the connexion of Dorieus with Athene, or with this temple, was not established. Moreover (6) what of Philip of Kroton? (c. 47 *infra*) who would likewise have had his reward. It is, however, obvious that Hdt. attaches considerable weight to the Sybarite argument. Probably the *μέγιστον μαρτύριον* outweighs all others with him, as it carries a divine moral with it. A '*παράπρηξις*' must be discovered to account for the failure and fate of Dorieus; not that Delphi would have admitted a non-fulfilment of prophecy in the case. Dorieus did indeed obtain *ἐπ᾽ ἣν ἐστέλλετο χώρην*. Cp. c. 43 *supra*. Hdt. himself may have wished to side with the Sybarites, his townsmen, but he cannot bring himself to force the argument.

10. **ἐξαίρετα . . πολλά.** Not all confined perhaps to landed property. Cp. the demands of Maiandrios 3. 142.

τὰ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι ἐνέμοντο (imperf.). The obvious suggestion of this phrase certainly is that Hdt. had been to the spot, or district, before he wrote this; yet the inference is not binding, cp. 4. 124 and Introduction, p. xcv.

46. 1. **Σπαρτιητέων.** Cp. c. 42 *supra*.

2. **οἵ**, clumsy, for it apparently includes Dorieus but excludes Euryleon.

3. **παντὶ στόλῳ.** Cp. *κοινῷ στόλῳ ἀπικόμενοι* 6. 39, *στρατιῆς μέγας στόλος* 4. 145, *ἰδίῳ στόλῳ* c. 36 *infra*, *μέζω στόλον στείλαντες* c. 64 *infra*. The word carries with it, perhaps, a suggestion of official authority or sanction, and is used here, not unintentionally, of the arrival of the leaders at their proper destination.

4. **Φοινίκων καὶ Ἐγεσταίων.** The 'Phoenicians' would be men of Carthage (cp. c. 42 *supra*), or of the Carthaginian settlements in Sicily, which might of course cover older colonies from Phoe-

*συγκτιστέων περιεγένετο τούτου τοῦ πάθεος. συλλαβὼν δὲ οὗτος
τῆς στρατιῆς τοὺς περιγενομένους ἔσχε Μινώην τὴν Σελινουσίων
ἀποικίην, καὶ συνελευθέρου Σελινουσίους τοῦ μουνάρχου Πειθ-
αγόρεω. μετὰ δὲ ὡς τοῦτον κατεῖλε, αὐτὸς τυραννίδι ἐπεχείρησε
Σελινοῦντος καὶ ἐμουνάρχησε χρόνον ἐπ' ὀλίγον· οἱ γάρ μιν
Σελινούσιοι ἐπαναστάντες ἀπέκτειναν καταφυγόντα ἐπὶ Διὸς
ἀγοραίου βωμόν. συνέσπετο δὲ Δωριέι καὶ συναπέθανε Φίλιππος* 47
*ὁ Βουτακίδεω Κροτωνιήτης ἀνήρ, ὃς ἁρμοσάμενος Τήλυος τοῦ
Συβαρίτεω θυγατέρα ἔφυγε ἐκ Κρότωνος, ψευσθεὶς δὲ τοῦ γάμου
οἴχετο πλέων ἐς Κυρήνην, ἐκ ταύτης δὲ ὁρμώμενος συνέσπετο
οἰκηίῃ τε τριήρεϊ καὶ οἰκηίῃ ἀνδρῶν δαπάνῃ, ἐών τε Ὀλυμπιονίκης
καὶ κάλλιστος Ἑλλήνων τῶν κατ' ἑωυτόν. διὰ δὲ τὸ ἑωυτοῦ
κάλλος ἠνείκατο παρὰ Ἐγεσταίων τὰ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος· ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ
τάφου αὐτοῦ ἡρώιον ἱδρυσάμενοι θυσίῃσι αὐτὸν ἱλάσκονται.*

Δωριεὺς μέν νυν τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ἐτελεύτησε· εἰ δὲ ἠνέσχετο 48

---

nicia proper. Egesta was a non-Hellenic city, a city of the Elymi people of supposed Troian origin. (Cp. Freeman, *Sicily*, i. 200 ff., Thuc. 6. 2.)

6. **Μινώην τ. Σ. ἀπ.** "The town at the mouth of the Halykos" (Freeman). Presumably 'Phoenician' before it passed into Hellenic hands; perhaps only acquired for Selinus by Euryleon. Cp. Freeman, *Sicily*, ii. p. 96.

7. **Πειθαγόρεω.** The name must not be confounded with Pythagoras. 'Monarch' = tyrant. There is some point in his death at the altar of *Ζεὺς ἀγοραῖος*, but Hdt. has no consequent *ἄγος* to record.

9. **ἐπ' ὀλίγον,** 'but not for long.'

This story of Western adventure is presumably from Sikeliote sources, but contains no evidence that Hdt. had ever actually set foot in Sicily.

47. 1. **καὶ συναπέθανε.** Dorieus clearly lost his life. Cp. 7. 158, 205.

2. **ἁρμοσάμενος.** Cp. *ἡρμόσατο* c. 32 *supra*.

4. **ἐς Κυρήνην.** The connexion or route between Magna Graecia and Kyrene is significant (Thuc. 7. 50, 2). Cp. Introduction, pp. xcvii ff. It was presumably in Libya that Philippos made acquaintance with Dorieus, c. 42 *supra*, and he may have had something to say to the subsequent direction of Dorieus' movements.

5. **οἰκηίῃ.** The *στόλος* of Dorieus was provided at the public expense. Cp. cc. 42, 43, 46 *supra*.

8. **ἱλάσκονται.** This Hero-worship of an Hellenic shade at Egesta (Segesta) is doubly remarkable, for (1) he has been fighting against the Segestaeans, and (2) they were not Greeks. The case of Onesilos in Amathus in Kypros c. 114 *infra* is similar. Stein remarks that it cannot have been his beauty for which Philippos was worshipped; but why not? Freeman (*Sicily*, ii. 95) compares the effect of the personal appearance of the Rhodian Dorieus upon the Athenians, Xen. *Hell.* 1. 5, 19, but considers the Segestaean tribute to Philip higher "as paid to a dead man," and "more distinctly a tribute to beauty as such." The tribute of worship was properly paid to dead men: it would have been a still higher tribute to have worshipped him alive (cp. 7. 56). Prof. Freeman makes the pregnant remark that "it must have been when they came to strip the slain," that the men of Segesta "were overcome by the majestic form, noble even in death, of the victor of Olympia." However, they might, perhaps, have seen him alive in the battle. Cp. the case of Leon, 7. 180. (In regard to the proper name of the city, Segesta is the more correct, but both are found on coins, cp. B. Head, *Historia*, pp. 144 ff. The MSS. here vary between *ἐγεσταίων* and *αἰγεσταίων*.)

48. 1. **Δωριεὺς . . ἐτελεύτησε.** The *Story of Dorieus* (cc. 42-48) looks like an episode, and insertion, based by no means in the main upon local Spartan

βασιλευόμενος ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος καὶ κατέμενε ἐν Σπάρτῃ, ἐβασίλευσε ἂν Λακεδαίμονος· οὐ γάρ τινα πολλὸν χρόνον ἦρξε ὁ Κλεομένης, ἀλλ' ἀπέθανε ἄπαις, θυγατέρα μούνην λιπών, τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Γοργώ.

49 Ἀπικνέεται δὲ ὦν ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην Κλεομένεος ἔχοντος τὴν ἀρχήν· τῷ δὴ ἐς λόγους ἤιε, ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι, ἔχων χάλκεον πίνακα ἐν τῷ γῆς ἁπάσης

---

authorities or sources. The 'Sybarite' and 'Krotoniate' authorities are, indeed, nominated in general terms: the finale (cc. 46, 47) has a strong 'Sicilian' colour: the first colonial adventure (cc. 42, 43) might have been recorded at Delphi: for the Spartan situation Hdt. might have been indebted to Spartan sources, either on the spot, or emigrant. (See c. 42 *supra*.) But few writers were in a position to combine or to contagminate these various sources as Hdt. has done: and the result can hardly have been accomplished before his settlement at Thurii. Of the general truth of the story there need be no doubt: and true or transfigured, its significance is not small. The desultory efforts to make way against the barbarian in Libya and the west: the rivalries and mutual destruction of Hellenic states: the canker (cp. c. 28 *supra*) of internal *στάσις*: the careers open to the military or political adventurer: the position and influence of Delphi: the character and spread of Hellenic art, religion, ethics: all these, and other points, are illuminated by this well-told story, which ranks with the tale of Demokedes (3. 131 ff.) in historic interest, if not in artistic finish. Cp. further, Appendix VII. § 4.

3. **οὐ . . τινα πολλὸν χρόνον.** A very remarkable observation, for Kleomenes must be taken to have been king about 30 years or so, on Hdt.'s own showing: cp. 3. 148, 6. 73. The former passage finds him on the throne about 516 B.C. (cp. Duncker, vi.[5] 500 *n.*). The latter reference keeps him on the throne till the eve of the battle of Marathon, nearly 20 years after the death of Dorieus; and the exile, restoration and death of Kleomenes have still to take place. The moral argument has proved too much for Hdt.'s chronology. Still the fact remains that Kleomenes was succeeded by his *brother* Leonidas. If Dorieus had remained in Sparta and survived Kleomenes, he would presumably have been king, and perhaps have wedded Gorgo. He was, however, married in Sparta, for he left there a son Euryanax (9. 10), who had apparently no right to the throne against Leonidas. Cp. c. 42 *supra*. On the chronology of Kleomenes' reign, cp. Appendix VII. § 3.

4. **ἄπαις.** The Ephors had not tried to secure him male issue, as the succession was provided for in the persons of his brothers, cp. c. 39 *supra*. Gorgo became the wife of her uncle Leonidas (7. 239), and was presumably the mother of Pleistarchos (9. 10).

49. 1. **δὲ ὦν.** Going back to c. 38 before the digression cc. 39-48.

τύραννος. Aristagoras is incorrectly and inconsistently here described, for (1) he was only vicegerent of the tyranny c. 25 *supra*, (2) he had laid down the tyranny c. 37. But the story of Aristagoras' visit to Sparta comes perhaps from Spartan sources, in which he may have been so described. The λόγῳ in c. 37 is probably harmonistic.

2. **ἀρχήν,** *sc.* *τὴν βασιληίην* (cp. 6. 106). The way his colleague is ignored is remarkable. Demaratos was still in possession of the second kingship. The date is very vague, but arguing back from the date of the capture of Miletos (6. 18) and supposing Aristagoras to have visited Sparta (and Athens) in the winter before the first campaign, his visit would fall at the earliest into the winter of 500-499 B.C. or at latest, the winter of 499-8 B.C. Cp. Appendix V.

ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι. The phrase seems to carry 'Lakedaemonian' authority for the whole account of Aristagoras' visit to Sparta, *i.e.* (1) the exhibition of the pinax, (2) the interview, or interviews, with the Eurysthenid (Agid) king, (3) the speech and arguments of Aristagoras. But the historian's art must also be reckoned with. The dialect is certainly his: but is that all? Cp. Appendix VII. § 8.

3. **πίναξ.** This metal map of the earth was perhaps a fabrication of

περίοδος ἐνετέτμητο καὶ θάλασσά τε πᾶσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες. ἀπικνεόμενος δὲ ἐς λόγους ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτὸν τάδε. "Κλεόμενες, σπουδὴν μὲν τὴν ἐμὴν μὴ θωμάσῃς τῆς ἐνθαῦτα ἀπίξιος· τὰ γὰρ κατήκοντά ἐστι τοιαῦτα· Ἰώνων παῖδας δούλους εἶναι ἀντ᾽ ἐλευθέρων ὄνειδος καὶ ἄλγος μέγιστον μὲν αὐτοῖσι ἡμῖν, ἔτι δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ὑμῖν, ὅσῳ προέστατε τῆς Ἑλλάδος. νῦν ὦν πρὸς θεῶν τῶν Ἑλληνίων ῥύσασθε Ἴωνας ἐκ δουλοσύνης ἄνδρας ὁμαίμονας. εὐπετέως δὲ ὑμῖν ταῦτα οἷά τε χωρέειν ἐστί· οὔτε γὰρ οἱ βάρβαροι ἄλκιμοί εἰσι, ὑμεῖς τε τὰ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον ἐς τὰ μέγιστα ἀνήκετε ἀρετῆς πέρι, ἥ τε μάχη αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τοιήδε, τόξα

Anaximandros (Strabo 7, Meineke i. p. 8) and exhibited the great Ionian scheme of geography, which Hdt. so heartily despised, 4. 36. (Cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.) It does not appear certain that Hdt. had himself seen this map, or pinax, nor do we know its subsequent history. Grote observes (iii. 497) that it evidently made a profound impression at Sparta. Its construction marks an epoch in Greek geography (see Bunbury, *History of Anc. Geography*, i. 145, and more particularly Hugo Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen*, Erste Abtheilung, pp. 1 ff.). If, however, Anaximandros was born 611 B.C. (Ueberweg, i. 34), and Aristagoras really brought a map of Anaximandros to Sparta, the map can hardly have been up to date. Agathemeros, 1. 1 (*Geogr. min.* ii. p. 471), appears to say that Hekataios made some much admired improvements on the map of Anaximandros, and it has frequently been suggested that the *tabula* displayed by Aristagoras was the work of Hekataios. Cp. Forbiger, *Handb. d. alt. Geogr.* i. 58. But the map of Hekataios was a *γράμμα*, not a *πίναξ*. Strabo 7.

5. **ἀπικνεόμενος**. Aristagoras, despot of Miletos, is represented as interviewing Kleomenes, king of Sparta, as though the latter could act in and for Sparta on equal terms with him. There is a latent reason for this: see Appendix VII. § 8.

τάδε. How the exact words, or arguments, which passed at a presumably secret interview, were divulged, it is not Hdt.'s way to state: cp. 4. 137 *et al.* Aristagoras, however, repeated himself at Athens, c. 97 *infra*, and see c. 51.

7. **τὰ κατήκοντα,** 1. 97, with *πρήγματα* 8. 19, 40, 102, passages in which *τὰ κατήκοντα* are contrasted with *τὸ ποιητέον*.

9. **ὑμῖν.** The plural would not be inadmissible in a private appeal to the king, but both the grammar and the argument, addressed to the Spartan sense of honour, suggest a larger audience.

ὅσῳ προέστατε τῆς Ἑλλάδος. The Spartan *προστασία* had been formally recognised, perhaps for the first time, about the middle of the sixth century B.C., by Kroisos 1. 69, on account of their power, *δυνατωτάτους*, c. 56, and prominence, *προέχοντας* c. 56. Since then, the claim had been again and again endorsed and acted on: by the Ionians and Aiolians (1. 141, 152), by Samians (3. 46, 148), by Athenians (6. 63), by Boeotians (6. 108), to say nothing of Scythians (6. 84). The argument is strictly appropriate to the time and place, though in Hdt.'s own day it might have counted—in some places—as antiquated.

10. **πρὸς θεῶν τῶν Ἑλληνίων** contains a fresh argument, and further illustration of the unity of Hellas, such as it was. Cp. c. 92 *infra ad fin.* *Ζεὺς Ἑλλήνιος* 9. 7.

ἄνδρας ὁμαίμονας contains a third argument. The assertion of a relationship, a consanguinity, between Sparta and Ionia is not to be overlooked, and can hardly be explained by an admixture of Dorian (Epidaurian) elements among the settlers in Ionia, 1. 146, or even by the large mixture of non-Dorian elements in Sparta. The national pedigree had already been invented, cp. 1. 56-58, 8. 144. The kinship is by male descent.

11. **εὐπετέως.** A negative argument combined with a subtle compliment to Sparta (*ὑμεῖς κτλ.*) which would have been rather thrown away on a single Spartan. With the passage which follows should be compared 1. 71.

13. **ἥ τε μάχη.** The inferiority of

καὶ αἰχμὴ βραχέα· ἀναξυρίδας δὲ ἔχοντες ἔρχονται ἐς τὰς μάχας καὶ κυρβασίας ἐπὶ τῇσι κεφαλῇσι. οὕτω εὐπετέες χειρωθῆναί εἰσι. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀγαθὰ τοῖσι τὴν ἤπειρον ἐκείνην νεμομένοισι ὅσα οὐδὲ τοῖσι συνάπασι ἄλλοισι, ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ ἀρξαμένοισι, ἄργυρος καὶ χαλκὸς καὶ ἐσθὴς ποικίλη καὶ ὑποζύγιά τε καὶ ἀνδράποδα· τὰ θυμῷ βουλόμενοι αὐτοὶ ἂν ἔχοιτε. κατοίκηνται δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενοι ὡς ἐγὼ φράσω, Ἰώνων μὲν τῶνδε οἵδε Λυδοί, οἰκέοντές τε χώρην ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολυαργυρώτατοι ἐόντες." δεικνὺς δὲ ἔλεγε ταῦτα ἐς τῆς γῆς τὴν περίοδον, τὴν ἐφέρετο ἐν τῷ πίνακι ἐντετμημένην. "Λυδῶν δέ" ἔφη λέγων ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης "οἵδε ἔχονται Φρύγες οἱ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ, πολυπροβατώτατοί τε ἐόντες πάντων τῶν ἐγὼ οἶδα καὶ πολυκαρπότατοι. Φρυγῶν δὲ ἔχονται Καππαδόκαι, τοὺς ἡμεῖς Συρίους καλέομεν. τούτοισι δὲ πρόσουροι Κίλικες, κατήκοντες ἐπὶ θάλασσαν τήνδε, ἐν τῇ ἥδε Κύπρος νῆσος κέεται· οἳ πεντακόσια τάλαντα βασιλέι τὸν ἐπέτειον φόρον ἐπιτελεῦσι. Κιλίκων δὲ τῶνδε ἔχονται Ἀρμένιοι οἵδε, καὶ οὗτοι ἐόντες πολυπρόβατοι, Ἀρμενίων δὲ Ματιηνοὶ χώρην τήνδε ἔχοντες. ἔχεται δὲ τούτων γῆ ἥδε Κισσίη, ἐν τῇ δὴ παρὰ ποταμὸν τόνδε Χοάσπην κείμενά ἐστι τὰ Σοῦσα ταῦτα, ἔνθα βασιλεύς τε μέγας δίαιταν ποιέεται, καὶ τῶν χρημάτων οἱ θησαυροὶ ἐνθαῦτά εἰσι· ἑλόντες δὲ ταύτην τὴν πόλιν θαρσέοντες ἤδη τῷ Διὶ πλούτου πέρι ἐρίζετε. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν χώρης ἄρα

---

the armour and weapons of the Barbarians is recognised by Hdt. as one of the causes of the subsequent Greek victory, see 9. 62.

14. **ἀναξυρίδας . . κυρβασίας.** The proper Median vestment. Cp. 6. 112, 7. 61, 62. Cp. c. 9 *supra*.

16. **ἀγαθά.** A utilitarian and economic argument, which ought to have been thrown away upon the votaries of the Lykurgean discipline. Compare the story told of Pausanias and the spoils of Plataea, 9. 80, also the story told of Kleomenes himself, 3. 148.

21. **πολυαργυρώτατοι.** Cp. 1. 94.

24. **πολυπροβατώτατοι.** Phrygia was no doubt rich in flocks: Strabo 568, 578, Aristoph. *Birds* 493 (*Il.* 3. 185 horses).

25. **τῶν ἐγὼ οἶδα,** though a standing formula with Hdt. (cp. Introduction, p. civ), may be put here into the mouth of Aristagoras to emphasise his responsibility for the exaggerations.

πολυκαρπότατοι. Specially the grape: *ἤδη καὶ Φρυγίην εἰσήλυθον ἀμπελόεσσαν*, *Il.* 3. 184.

26. **Συρίους.** Cp. 1. 72; 7. 72.

The *Kappadokae* and the *Kilikes* offer apparently no inducement to the spoiler. However, slave-dealing would go without saying (*ἀνδράποδα supra*). And cp. 3. 90, where the wealth of Kilikia appears.

27. *Kypros* is better known c. 31 *supra*; but on the tribute cp. 3. 91, tested by which passage the 500 T. would appear a gross exaggeration.—*Armenia*, *κατύπερθε Ἀσσυρίων* 1. 194, north of Babylonia; cp. 1. 180 in Hdt.'s own geography. But cp. c. 52 *infra*.—*Matieni* must stand for Assyrians, whom Aristagoras omits, in accordance with Hdt.'s predominant use of the term. Cp. c. 52 *infra*, and on the geography of the road Appendix XIII.—*Kissia*, 6. 119. The *Choaspes* (1. 188) is certainly the modern Kerkha.—*Susa*, the capital of Susiana (Elam), of which Kissia was a district, or province. Susa and Kissia were tributary (3. 91), not so Persia proper (3. 97).

35. **Διί.** Cp. 7. 56, 203. There is a

οὐ πολλῆς οὐδὲ οὕτω χρηστῆς καὶ οὔρων σμικρῶν χρεόν ἐστι ὑμέας μάχας ἀναβάλλεσθαι πρός τε Μεσσηνίους ἐόντας ἰσοπαλέας καὶ Ἀρκάδας τε καὶ Ἀργείους, τοῖσι οὔτε χρυσοῦ ἐχόμενόν ἐστι οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀργύρου, τῶν πέρι καί τινα ἐνάγει προθυμίη μαχόμενον ἀποθνήσκειν· παρέχον δὲ τῆς Ἀσίης πάσης ἄρχειν εὐπετέως, ἄλλο τι αἱρήσεσθε;" Ἀρισταγόρης μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεξε, Κλεομένης δὲ ἀμείβετο τοισίδε. "ὦ ξεῖνε Μιλήσιε, ἀναβάλλομαί τοι ἐς τρίτην ἡμέρην ὑποκρινέεσθαι."

50 τότε μὲν ἐς τοσοῦτον ἤλασαν· ἐπείτε δὲ ἡ κυρίη ἡμέρη ἐγένετο τῆς ὑποκρίσιος καὶ ἦλθον ἐς τὸ συγκείμενον, εἴρετο ὁ Κλεομένης τὸν Ἀρισταγόρην ὁκοσέων ἡμερέων ἀπὸ θαλάσσης τῆς Ἰώνων ὁδὸς εἴη παρὰ βασιλέα. ὁ δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης τἆλλα ἐὼν σοφὸς καὶ διαβάλλων ἐκεῖνον εὖ ἐν τούτῳ ἐσφάλη· χρεὸν γάρ μιν μὴ λέγειν τὸ ἐόν, βουλόμενόν γε Σπαρτιήτας ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, λέγει δ' ὦν τριῶν μηνῶν φὰς εἶναι τὴν ἄνοδον. ὁ δὲ ὑπαρπάσας τὸν ἐπίλοιπον λόγον τὸν ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ὥρμητο λέγειν περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, εἶπε "ὦ ξεῖνε Μιλήσιε, ἀπαλλάσσεο ἐκ Σπάρτης πρὸ

---

frivolous, exaggerated, and 'hybristic' tone about this speech, which helps to explain and justify the rejection of Aristagoras' suit at Sparta. Whether the speech is true and authentic is of course another question.

37. **μάχας ἀναβάλλεσθαι.** *ἀναβάλλομαι ὑποκρινέεσθαι* just below: *κυρώσειν* 6. 86 *infra*: *μὴ οὐ μηχανήσασθαι* 6. 88: *ὥρη μηχανᾶσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι* 3. 85: *ὑποκρίνασθαι* 9. 8 make it extremely difficult to take *ἀναβάλλεσθαι* in this passage in any sense but 'put off,' 'postpone.'

Μεσσηνίους. If this refers to the so-called first and second 'Messenian wars,' it is one of two allusions to them in the whole of Hdt.'s work, cp. 3. 47. It may, however, only be a shadow or suggestion, reflected back from the 'third' war. Cp. 9. 35; though *ἰσοπαλέας* may be thought against this.

ἰσοπαλέας. Cp. 1. 82. Whereas the barbarians were *εὐπετέες χειρωθῆναι supra*. The argument, however, would have been a curious one to use in order to persuade the Spartans to send a strong force to Asia: a thing they could only venture to do when they had nothing to fear from their neighbours, cp. 1. 68.

38. **Ἀρκάδας.** Cp. 1. 66, 9. 35.

Ἀργείους. A big war with Argos was probably impending though neither Aristagoras nor Hdt. seems to realise the fact. Cp. 6. 76 ff.

39. **τῶν πέρι.** The Milesian appeals to the basest motives, and this at Sparta: these be 'Ionian' sentiments. Not but what Hdt. shows that a Spartiate would do a good deal for filthy lucre. Cp. the story of Glaukos 6. 86. Aristagoras, however, appeals also to other and more respectable motives as well: (1) Honour and ambition, (2) Religion, (3) Affection. See *supra*.

40. **τῆς Ἀσίης πάσης.** Probably an anachronism. That any Greek in the year 500 B.C. had such a notion is unlikely, though before Hdt. wrote, or gathered his materials, the march to Susa had loomed up as a possibility, a dream, which republican Greece was not destined to realise. Cp. Appendix VII. § 8.

50. 1. **ἐς τοσοῦτον**, 'no further.' Cp. c. 28 *supra*.

5. **διαβάλλων.** Obviously different from the use in c. 96; but identical with the use (*bis*) c. 97.

7. **ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην.** What Aristagoras would have wished was that the Spartans should attack not Susa but Sardes. This the Athenians actually did. Aristagoras' speech begins with a petition for the protection and liberation of Ionia, and ends with the offer of an Asiatic empire.

λέγει δ' ὦν, *sc. τὸ ἐόν*. Cp. 6. 50.

10. **ἀπαλλάσσεο ἐκ Σπάρτης πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου.** Years before when Kleomenes wished to employ the *xenelasy* against Maiandrios of Samos, he must

δύντος ἡλίου· οὐδένα γὰρ λόγον εὐεπέα λέγεις Λακεδαιμονίοισι,
51 ἐθέλων σφέας ἀπὸ θαλάσσης τριῶν μηνῶν ὁδὸν ἀγαγεῖν." ὁ μὲν
δὴ Κλεομένης ταῦτα εἴπας ἤιε ἐς τὰ οἰκία, ὁ δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης
λαβὼν ἱκετηρίην ἤιε ἐς τοῦ Κλεομένεος, ἐσελθὼν δὲ ἔσω ἅτε
ἱκετεύων ἐπακοῦσαι ἐκέλευε τὸν Κλεομένεα ἀποπέμψαντα τὸ παι-
δίον· προσεστήκεε γὰρ δὴ τῷ Κλεομένεϊ ἡ θυγάτηρ, τῇ οὔνομα
ἦν Γοργώ· τοῦτο δέ οἱ καὶ μοῦνον τέκνον ἐτύγχανε ἐὸν ἐτέων
ὀκτὼ ἢ ἐννέα ἡλικίην. Κλεομένης δὲ λέγειν μιν ἐκέλευε τὰ βού-
λεται μηδὲ ἐπισχεῖν τοῦ παιδίου εἵνεκα. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης
ἄρχετο ἐκ δέκα ταλάντων ὑπισχνεόμενος, ἤν οἱ ἐπιτελέσῃ
τῶν ἐδέετο. ἀνανεύοντος δὲ τοῦ Κλεομένεος προέβαινε τοῖσι
χρήμασι ὑπερβάλλων ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης, ἐς οὗ πεντήκοντά τε
τάλαντα ὑπεδέδεκτο καὶ τὸ παιδίον ηὐδάξατο "πάτερ, διαφθερέει
σε ὁ ξεῖνος, ἢν μὴ ἀποστὰς ἴῃς." ὅ τε δὴ Κλεομένης ἡσθεὶς τοῦ
παιδίου τῇ παραινέσι ἤιε ἐς ἕτερον οἴκημα, καὶ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης
ἀπαλλάσσετο τὸ παράπαν ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης, οὐδέ οἱ ἐξεγένετο ἐπὶ
πλέον ἔτι σημῆναι περὶ τῆς ἀνόδου τῆς παρὰ βασιλέα.

52 Ἔχει γὰρ ἀμφὶ τῇ ὁδῷ ταύτῃ ὧδε· σταθμοί τε πανταχῇ εἰσι βασιλήιοι καὶ καταλύσιες κάλλισται, διὰ οἰκεομένης τε ἡ ὁδὸς ἅπασα καὶ ἀσφαλέος. διὰ μέν γε Λυδίης καὶ Φρυγίης σταθμοὶ

---

fain call in the Ephors, 3. 148; here he is represented apparently as enforcing it himself. We may well doubt if a king had this competence. It is not enumerated among the γέρεα 6. 56 ff.

51. 4. **ἀποπέμψαντα** 'after dismissing.' The immortal anecdote of Gorgo's astounding precocity, if true, must obviously be traced to the lady herself, since neither Kleomenes nor Aristagoras can be supposed to have divulged a story, the circumstances of which were so discreditable to both. The conduct of Kleomenes upon this occasion offers an interesting contrast to his youthful virtue some fifteen years before (3. 148). Thus men with age degenerate! Fifty talents would be some £12,000. Was it a bribe, or a war-subsidy? Themistokles afterwards, according to report, received thirty from the Euboeans 8. 4: sixty was all the Athenians obtained from the Egestaians in 415 B.C. (Thucyd. 6. 8) at that time, just enough to keep sixty vessels on service for one month. But it is hardly worth while to rationalise the fifty talents, when the story as a whole is discredited. See Appendix VII. § 8.

6. **Γοργώ.** The description is remarkable, coming so soon after c. 48. The two passages probably are independent.

52. 1. **ὧδε.** This itinerary from Sardes to Susa is introduced on the somewhat lame plea that Aristagoras was prevented from enlarging further to Kleomenes περὶ τῆς ἀνόδου τῆς παρὰ βασιλέα. Had Anaxagoras been allowed to continue, he would hardly have spent his time on such an itinerary, even had he been qualified to expound it. The description of the road is a duller replica of the speech of Aristagoras just before: or perhaps rather the speech of A. is a lively creation based upon the itinerary. Cp. notes *infra*. The use of ἀμφὶ is remarkable.

That the road was well provided with guard stations (cp. c. 35 *supra*) would not have been a good argument to induce the Spartans to take to it: and so of the gates, rivers, etc. But the fact that it avoided the deserts (διὰ οἰκεομένης) might have been an inducement to the spoiler. So Aristagoras above indicates the countries by their inhabitants. On the stations (σταθμοί) and Khans (καταλύσιες) Baehr's note should be consulted.

3. **Λυδίης.** Λυδῶν ἔχονται Φρύγες c. 49 *supra*.

τείνοντες εἴκοσί εἰσι, παρασάγγαι δὲ τέσσερες καὶ ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἥμισυ. ἐκδέκεται δὲ ἐκ τῆς Φρυγίης ὁ Ἅλυς ποταμός, ἐπ᾽ ᾧ πύλαι τε ἔπεισι, τὰς διεξελάσαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη καὶ οὕτω διεκπερᾶν τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ φυλακτήριον μέγα ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ. διαβάντι δὲ ἐς τὴν Καππαδοκίην καὶ ταύτῃ πορευομένῳ μέχρι οὔρων τῶν Κιλικίων σταθμοὶ δυῶν δέοντές εἰσι τριήκοντα, παρασάγγαι δὲ τέσσερες καὶ ἑκατόν. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖσι τούτων οὔροισι διξάς τε πύλας διεξελᾷς καὶ διξὰ φυλακτήρια παραμείψεαι. ταῦτα δὲ διεξελάσαντι καὶ διὰ τῆς Κιλικίης ὁδὸν ποιευμένῳ τρεῖς εἰσι σταθμοί, παρασάγγαι δὲ πεντεκαίδεκα καὶ ἥμισυ. οὖρος δὲ Κιλικίης καὶ τῆς Ἀρμενίης ἐστὶ ποταμὸς νηυσιπέρητος, τῷ οὔνομα Εὐφρήτης. ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἀρμενίῃ σταθμοὶ μέν εἰσι καταγωγέων πεντεκαίδεκα, παρασάγγαι δὲ ἓξ καὶ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἥμισυ, καὶ φυλακτήριον ἐν αὐτοῖσι. ἐκ δὲ ταύτης [τῆς Ἀρμενίης] ἐσβάλλοντι ἐς τὴν Ματιηνὴν γῆν σταθμοί εἰσι τέσσερες καὶ τριήκοντα, παρασάγγαι δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ τριήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν. ποταμοὶ δὲ νηυσιπέρητοι τέσσερες διὰ ταύτης ῥέουσι, τοὺς πᾶσα ἀνάγκη διαπορθμεῦσαί ἐστι, πρῶτος μὲν Τίγρης, μετὰ δὲ δεύτερός τε καὶ τρίτος ὡυτὸς ὀνομαζόμενος, οὐκ ὡυτὸς

5. **ὁ Ἅλυς.** It is curious that Hdt. does not here expressly notice the bridge, cp. 1. 75; but perhaps the mention of the gates (*πύλαι*) on the river, and the phraseology (*διεξελάσαι . . διεκπερᾶν*), may be taken to imply a bridge, specially when contrasted with *διαπορθμεῦσαι* *infra*. The fact is the road must have crossed the Halys twice: (1) between Ankyra and Pteria or Tavium, (2) between Pteria and Mazaka, or some other town on the way to Euphrates. The bridge was presumably at the former passage. Hdt. was not accurately informed of the course of the Halys. See Appendix XIII. § 4.

8. **Καππαδοκίην.** *Φρυγῶν ἔχονται Καππαδόκαι*, c. 49 *supra*.

Κιλικίων. *τούτοισι δὲ πρόσουροι Κίλικες*, c. 49 *supra*. It appears possible that Herodotus here refers to the celebrated *Pylae Kilikiae*, through which, Prof. Ramsay has said, "led the main road from all parts of the plateau of Asia minor to Cilicia in all periods of history" (*Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, pp. 349 f.). But the Royal Road, as described by Hdt., cannot have gone through the *Pylae Kilikiae*. A Kilikia, of which the Euphrates was a frontier, could never have been traversed in 15½ parasangs from the Gates, **διξάς, διξά**, cp. c. 40 *supra*, and Appendix XIII. § 4, note.

15. **Ἀρμενίῃ.** *Κιλίκων ἔχονται Ἀρμένιοι*, c. 49 *supra*. *ἐν αὐτοῖσι* is vague, but presumably = *ἐν τοῖς Ἀρμενίοις*.

17. **ἐκ δὲ ταύτης [τῆς Ἀρμενίης] κτλ.** Stein has transposed the sentence from below, and bracketed *τ.* Ἀ. as an obvious gloss. The transposition redeems Hdt. from an extraordinary blunder, on which, and on the corruption of the text, cp. Appendix XIII. § 2.

Ματιηνὴν γῆν. *Ἀρμενίων δὲ Ματιηνοί*, c. 49 *supra*.

18. **τέσσερες.** After this word de la Barre (1729) proposed to insert the words *καὶ τριήκοντα, παρασάγγαι δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ τριήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν*. The emendation is certain, for (1) otherwise no Parasangs are given for Matiene; (2) the totals *infra* do not agree with the items; (3) the measurement suits the region here, as in the speech of Aristagoras, denominated Matiene. Stein completed the purification of the text by the transfer and the brackets above noted. The passages have, however, here been dittographed, the better to exhibit the state of the case.

21. **ὡυτὸς ὀνομαζόμενος, οὐκ ὡυτὸς ἐών.** There can be little doubt that the rivers in question are the Greater and the Lesser Zab. Weissenborn proposed *Σάβατος* instead of the first *ὡυτός*, van Herwerden prefers to insert *Σάβατος* after *οὐνομαζό-*

ἐὼν ποταμὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ῥέων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρότερον αὐτῶν καταλεχθεὶς ἐξ Ἀρμενίων ῥέει, ὁ δ' ὕστερον ἐκ Ματιηνῶν· ὁ δὲ τέταρτος τῶν ποταμῶν οὔνομα ἔχει Γύνδης, τὸν Κῦρος διέλαβέ κοτε ἐς διώρυχας ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριηκοσίας. ἐκ δὲ ταύτης τῆς Ἀρμενίης ἐσβάλλοντι ἐς τὴν Ματιηνὴν γῆν σταθμοί εἰσι τέσσερες. ἐκ δὲ ταύτης ἐς τὴν Κισσίην χώρην μεταβαίνοντι ἕνδεκα σταθμοί, παρασάγγαι δὲ δύο καὶ τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἥμισύ ἐστι ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Χοάσπην, ἐόντα καὶ τοῦτον νηυσιπέρητον· ἐπ' ᾧ Σοῦσα πόλις πεπόλισται. οὗτοι οἱ πάντες σταθμοί εἰσι ἕνδεκα καὶ

53 ἑκατόν. καταγωγαὶ μέν νυν σταθμῶν τοσαῦταί εἰσι ἐκ Σαρδίων ἐς Σοῦσα ἀναβαίνοντι. εἰ δὲ ὀρθῶς μεμέτρηται ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ βασιληίη τοῖσι παρασάγγησι καὶ ὁ παρασάγγης δύναται τριήκοντα στάδια, ὥσπερ οὗτός γε δύναται ταῦτα, ἐκ Σαρδίων στάδιά ἐστι ἐς τὰ βασιλήια τὰ Μεμνόνια καλεόμενα πεντακόσια καὶ τρισχίλια καὶ μύρια, παρασαγγέων ἐόντων πεντήκοντα καὶ τετρακοσίων. πεντήκοντα δὲ καὶ ἑκατὸν στάδια ἐπ' ἡμέρῃ ἑκάστῃ

54 διεξιοῦσι ἀναισιμοῦνται ἡμέραι ἀπαρτὶ ἐνενήκοντα. οὕτω τῷ Μιλησίῳ Ἀρισταγόρῃ εἴπαντι πρὸς Κλεομένεα τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον εἶναι τριῶν μηνῶν τὴν ἄνοδον τὴν παρὰ βασιλέα ὀρθῶς εἴρητο. εἰ δέ τις τὸ ἀτρεκέστερον τούτων ἔτι δίζηται, ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο σημανέω· τὴν γὰρ ἐξ Ἐφέσου ἐς Σάρδις ὁδὸν δεῖ προσλογίσασθαι ταύτῃ. καὶ δὴ λέγω σταδίους εἶναι τοὺς πάντας ἀπὸ θαλάσσης

μενος (*sic*) with Bobrik. The termination *-ζόμενος* makes this the more acceptable.

24. **τὸν Κῦρος.** Cp. 1. 189, 190. Hdt. firmly believed that item.

25. **ἐκ . . τέσσερες.** Cp. ll. 17, 18 *sup.*

27. **Κισσίην.** *ἔχεται δὲ τούτων γῆ ἥδε Κισσίη*, c. 49 *supra*.

29. **Χοάσπην . . Σοῦσα.** *ἐν τῇ δὴ παρὰ ποταμὸν τόνδε Χοάσπην κείμενά ἐστι τὰ Σοῦσα ταῦτα*, c. 49 *supra*.

It can hardly be doubted now that for the Itinerary Hdt. had written authority. That the distances are given in parasangs only shows that the road has been remeasured by Persian authority. The road itself, as Prof. W. M. Ramsay (*Asia Minor*, pp. 27 ff.) has demonstrated, was far older than the Persian period. The omission by Hdt. of all mention of the towns *en route* between Sardes and Susa is very unfortunate, and shows pretty plainly that there is no autopsy in the passage. That omission, the corruption of the text, and the introduction of the double Gates, have made the task of reconstructing, geographically, the actual course of the road, a difficult one. Kiepert gave the first adequate theory on the subject (*Monatsberichte d. Berlin. Akad.* 1857). Ramsay's more recent attempt (*op. cit. sup.*), where it departs from Kiepert's, is not in all respects preferable. For the fuller discussion of the question, and for Mr. Hogarth's argument in regard to the passage of the Euphrates, see App. XIII.

53. 2. **ὀρθῶς.** The total given in this c. did not correspond to the items in the c. preceding until de la Barre, followed by Stein, emended the passage above noticed. It is extremely unlikely that there was any arithmetical error in the text originally.

The Parasang (*farsang*) = 30 stadia = 3 m. 787½ yds. (2. 6). Ramsay reckons the Parasang at 2½ m. (*op. cit.* p. 43). 13,500 stades, or 1500-1600 miles, is probably not an over-estimate: this road, however, by no means followed the shortest available route from Sardes to the Halys, or again from the Halys to the Euphrates. See Appendix XIII.

7. **πεντήκοντα δὲ καὶ ἑκατόν.** This gives about 17-18 English miles to the day's march.

τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς μέχρι Σούσων (τοῦτο γὰρ Μεμνόνειον ἄστυ καλέεται) τεσσεράκοντα καὶ τετρακισχιλίους καὶ μυρίους· οἱ γὰρ ἐξ Ἐφέσου ἐς Σάρδις εἰσὶ τεσσεράκοντα καὶ πεντακόσιοι στάδιοι, καὶ οὕτω τρισὶ ἡμέρῃσι μηκύνεται ἡ τρίμηνος ὁδός.

55 Ἀπελαυνόμενος δὲ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης ἤιε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας γενομένας τυράννων ὧδε ἐλευθέρας. ἐπεὶ Ἵππαρχον τὸν Πεισιστράτου, Ἱππίεω δὲ τοῦ τυράννου ἀδελφεόν, ἰδόντα ὄψιν ἐνυπνίου [τῷ ἑωυτοῦ πάθεϊ] ἐναργεστάτην κτείνουσι Ἀριστογείτων καὶ Ἁρμόδιος, γένος ἐόντες τὰ ἀνέκαθεν Γεφυραῖοι, μετὰ ταῦτα ἐτυραννεύοντο Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπ᾽ ἔτεα τέσσερα οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸ τοῦ. ἡ μέν νυν ὄψις τοῦ Ἱππάρχου ἐνυπνίου ἦν 56

54. 7. Μεμνόνειον ἄστυ. At one end of the Royal Road is the city of Memnon, Susa (cp. 7. 151), at the other end are certain monuments which Hdt. held to be Egyptian, but others ascribed to Memnon, 2. 106. The monuments, incorrectly placed by Hdt. (cp. Ramsay, *op. c.* pp. 30, 60), are 'Hittite' or Syro-Kappadokian: and as Memnon certainly represents an Upper Asiatic power (cp. Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* i. § 256) there was more to be said for ascribing the monuments to Memnon than for ascribing them to Sesostris (cp. Wiedemann, note to Hdt. 2. 106). The *Akropolis* of Susa has been the scene of the brilliant labours of M. and Mde. Dieulafoy. Cp. *L'Acropole de Suse*, Paris, 1893; Billerbeck, *Susa*, Leipzig, 1893.

10. **ἡμέρῃσι.** It was the three days', not the three months', march which Aristagoras probably proposed to the Spartans. See c. 50 *supra*.

55. 1. τὰς Ἀθήνας. In the regular course of his narrative Hdt. brings Aristagoras to Athens. He takes occasion therefrom to insert a digression on the Peisistratidae, and the Liberation of Athens (cc. 55-95), which leads him to an excursus on the Gephyraeans (c. 57), which involves a note on the Phoenicians in Boeotia (c. 58), which excuses a remark upon the origin of Greek culture, which merges in an appendix on certain Kadmeian inscriptions at Thebes (cc. 59-61): after which the main digression is resumed (c. 62). This main digression performs admirably two requirements, of which its author appears unconscious: first, it helps to explain why the suit of Aristagoras was rejected at Sparta; secondly, it goes far to explain why it was granted at Athens. Both explanations are contained in the history of the ten or twelve years preceding the application of Aristagoras.

3. **Ἱππίεω τοῦ τυράννου ἀδελφεόν.** If these words are genuine (and none of the previous editors appear to have suspected them), Hdt. is entirely clear of the popular error, which represented Hipparchos as the tyrant, and Hippias as his successor. Cp. Thuc. 1. 20, 6. 54 ff., Ἀθ. πολ. c. 18. But nowhere does Hdt. expressly say that Hippias was the elder brother. Cp. c. 65 *infra*.

4. **τῷ . . πάθεϊ**? *seclusit* Stein. *πάθος* might have been introduced from Thuc. 6. 55, 4.

5. **τὰ ἀνέκαθεν.** Cp. c. 65 *infra*, 6. 35, 128.

6. **ἔτεα τέσσερα.** Cp. Thuc. 6. 59, 4 *τυραννεύσας δὲ ἔτη τρία Ἱππίας ἔτι Ἀθηναίων καὶ παυσθεὶς ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ*. Ἀθ. πολ. 19 *ἔτει δὲ τετάρτῳ μάλιστα μετὰ τὸν Ἱππάρχου θάνατον*. Cp. the further chronological indications in the passage. The absolute date for the assassination of Hipparchos remains where Clinton placed it: Hekatombaion 514 B.C. (cp. *Fasti, ad ann.* So also Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles u. Athen*, i. 21, 1893). As the death of Hipparchos occurs practically at the beginning of the Attic year (Panathenaea = end of Hekatombaion: Mommsen, *Heortologie*, pp. 129 ff.) the years here may be treated as (Attic) Calendar years: and the date of the expulsion of Hippias is fixed for 511-510 B.C. Ol. 67. 2, *ἐφ᾽ Ἁρπακτίδου*. Ἀθ. π. c. 19. Whether it is to be dated 511 B.C. or 510 B.C. depends on the *season* to which it may be fixed: anyway it takes place before Ol. 67. 3, Hekatombaion 510 B.C. (cp. *Marmor Parium*, ed. Flach. [illegible] = Ol. 67. 2).

56. 1. ὄψις . . ἐνυπνίου. So too in 7. 18, 47, 8. 54. Cp. *ὄψις ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ* 3. 30, 65.

ἤδε· ἐν τῇ προτέρῃ νυκτὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων ἐδόκεε ὁ Ἵππαρχος ἄνδρα οἱ ἐπιστάντα μέγαν καὶ εὐειδέα αἰνίσσεσθαι τάδε τὰ ἔπεα·

τλῆθι λέων ἄτλητα παθὼν τετληότι θυμῷ·
οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἀδικῶν τίσιν οὐκ ἀποτίσει.

ταῦτα δέ, ὡς ἡμέρη ἐγένετο τάχιστα, φανερὸς ἦν ὑπερτιθέμενος ὀνειροπόλοισι· μετὰ δὲ ἀπειπάμενος τὴν ὄψιν ἔπεμπε τὴν πομπήν, ἐν τῇ δὴ τελευτᾷ.

57 Οἱ δὲ Γεφυραῖοι, τῶν ἦσαν οἱ φονέες οἱ Ἱππάρχου, ὡς μὲν αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, ἐγεγόνεσαν ἐξ Ἐρετρίης τὴν ἀρχήν, ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω, ἦσαν Φοίνικες τῶν σὺν Κάδμῳ ἀπικομένων [Φοινίκων] ἐς γῆν τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίην καλεομένην, οἴκεον δὲ τῆς χώρης ταύτης ἀπολαχόντες τὴν Ταναγρικὴν μοῖραν. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ Καδμείων πρότερον ἐξαναστάντων ὑπ' Ἀργείων, οἱ Γεφυραῖοι

---

2. **Παναθηναίων.** For the chronological importance of this indication, see above. The institution or reorganisation of the *Panathenaea* was not improbably due to Peisistratos, with whose policy such a festival would admirably square. (Cp. Mommsen, *Heortologie*, p. 112, Curtius, *Gr. G.* i.[6] 358, 359.) The religion, like the political régime, of the sons is of a somewhat darker complexion: though the difference is one of degree rather than of kind.

5. **ἀποτίσει.** The authorship of this epigram is unknown; and it can hardly be supposed that it was a creation of Hipparchos' unconscious cerebration, or that he made it known. The ethical doctrine of the second line is Hellenic, even Delphic. Cp. 6. 84, and Introduction, p. cxv.

7. **ἀπειπάμενος.** *ἀπείπασθαι* is common in Hdt. in the sense of to *refuse:* cp. 4. 120, 6. 100, *et al.* Here its use seems peculiar: *averruncare*, cp. L. & S. *sub v.* ἀπεῖπον. The force of the middle voice in ἀπειπάμενος and of the imperfect tense in ἔπεμπε should not be missed.

8. **ἐν τῇ δὴ τελευτᾷ**, 'which he did not live to accomplish,' or simply, 'in which the end overtakes him.'

57. 1. **ὡς μὲν αὐτοὶ λέγουσι.** They might have been thought to be the best authority upon the subject. What grounds Hdt. had for discrediting the family tradition he does not state. Petersen, *Quaestiones de Historia Gentium Atticarum*, pp. 6 f., suggests that a false etymology was the basis of Hdt.'s conjecture. In Syria was a city yclept Gephyrae and Gephyra was an alias for the Boeotian Tanagra. (This was to be found in Hekataios, *vide* Steph. B. *sub v.*) Hence the 'Gephyraeans' were fabled to have come from Gephyrae and settled at Gephyra, before they found a home in Attica. But was it then an accident that the same name occurred in Phoenicia and in Boeotia, and for that matter in Attica? Some Semitic names in Hellas the etymologists will probably leave us (but cp. Busolt, i.[2] 251, 263-271); and Semitic names and other indications surely point to Semitic immigrants. Cp. further, note to c. 58 *infra*. Petersen derives the proper name from *γέφυρα*, a bridge = Pontifices. But the derivation of the word *γέφυρα* itself is uncertain, as indeed its original meaning (Grasberger, *Gr. Ortsnamen*, appears to make Γέφυρα = Dyke or Bridgetown, and suggests, p. 297, that the old name of Halikarnassos—Hdt.'s native city—was Ζεφύρα, which he apparently identifies with Γέφυρα). That the Gephyraeans should in Hellenic times disclaim their Semitic origin would not be inexplicable. Etym. Mag. has Γεφυρεῖς· Δῆμο[s] Ἀττικός, ὅθεν Γεφυραία Δημήτηρ (quoted in Petersen). Cp. L. & S. *s. v.* γεφυρι[σ]μός. The Γεφυραῖοι may have been th[e] rivals or doubles of the Γεφυρεῖς. W[e] should then have, in the last statemen[t] in this chapter, an evidence of the earl[y] independence of the Attic Demes.

6. **Καδμείων κτλ.** Cp. c. 61 *infra*, which shows that the war of the Epigon[i] is referred to. On the Kadmeian movement, cp. 1. 56. **Φοινίκων** *supra sec[l.]* Stein.

οὗτοι δεύτερα ὑπὸ Βοιωτῶν ἐξαναστάντες ἐτράποντο ἐπ᾽ Ἀθηνέων. Ἀθηναῖοι δέ σφεας ἐπὶ ῥητοῖσι ἐδέξαντο σφέων αὐτῶν εἶναι πολιήτας, πολλῶν τεων καὶ οὐκ ἀξιαπηγήτων ἐπιτάξαντες ἔργεσθαι.

Οἱ δὲ Φοίνικες οὗτοι οἱ σὺν Κάδμῳ ἀπικόμενοι, τῶν ἦσαν οἱ 58
Γεφυραῖοι, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ οἰκήσαντες ταύτην τὴν χώρην ἐσήγαγον διδασκάλια ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ δὴ καὶ γράμματα, οὐκ ἐόντα

---

7. **Βοιωτῶν.** Thuc. 1. 12, 3 dates the Boeotian movement sixty years after the capture of Troy. This passage in Hdt. is in substantial agreement with that in Thucydides, and the two probably have a common origin (Hekataios ?).

8. **Ἀθηναῖοι κτλ.** The terminology is suspiciously recent, and the statement seems to imply the *synoikism* of Attica, and a graded franchise. The partial taboo, or excommunication, looks like the most genuine element in the tradition: cp. first note *supra* and c. 61 *infra ad fin.* Madvig's insertion of *οὐ* before *πολλῶν* is acceptable.

58. 1. **οἱ Φοίνικες οὗτοι.** Presumably in part identical with the Kadmeians of c. 57, the other part being the Gephyraeans. Toepffer's article on the Gephyraeans (*Attisch. Genealogie*, pp. 293 ff.) exhibits the reaction against the 'Phoenician' theory. But the argument in favour of recognising Oriental and Semitic elements in the population of early Greece is not confined to local and gentile names, while the resolution of the traditions in its favour into mere products of pseudo-etymology is unacceptable. Questions respecting the primitive inhabitants of the Greek peninsula, or rather of the Aegean region, must be kept open, recent archaeological evidence tending (1) to push the perspective of diffusion and settlement further and further back; (2) to suggest greater complexity and mixture than the followers of K. O. Müller, whether old or new, have been willing to recognise.

3. **γράμματα.** Hdt.'s hypothesis in regard to the origin of the Greek alphabet resolves itself into two main propositions: (1) It was of Phoenician origin. (2) It was introduced or taught to the Greeks by the Phoenicians of Boeotia. It does not follow from these two propositions that the distinctively Greek alphabet was first used in Boeotia, much less in Thebes: rather the statement (3) that it was *Ionian περίοικοι* who received, assimilated, and transformed the Phoenician elements of culture (*διδασκάλια*), points to a different conclusion. It must, however, be admitted that the appeal in cc. 59 ff. to Theban examples of Kadmeian, *i.e.* palaeo-Hellenic letters, goes to show that Hdt. regarded Thebes as the cradle of Hellenic letters. Concerning this theory of Hdt. it is to be observed that, whatever be the character of 'Kadmos,' the ascription of the Greek alphabet to a Phoenician original is an 'historical' theory, as distinguished from a mythological theory (*e.g.* that of Aischylos, who ascribes it to Prometheus, *P. V.* 468 f.): secondly, that the theory is probably right. (Cp. Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy*, §§ 1 ff., Hinrichs, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, i. pp. 359 ff.) The same, however, cannot be said for the localisation of the primitive Greek alphabet in Boeotia, or even on the mainland of Greece. So far as evidences at present go, it appears that Greek alphabets were first employed in the islands of the Aegean, particularly Thera and Krete. It is a third point in the Herodotean hypothesis that it was the Ionians who first adapted the Phoenician alphabet to the service of the Hellenes. As Hdt. nowhere locates Ionians in Boeotia, this statement would tend to qualify the inference from his quoting only Theban inscriptions, and to suggest that he is, perhaps, thinking of Euboea, Attica, Peloponnese or the Marathonian tetrapolis, as the Ionian centres which had dealings with the 'Kadmeians,' though he is unable to adduce any instance of archaic lettering except from Thebes. On Hdt.'s view of the Ionian mediation it is to be observed that the Ionic alphabet was not the *first* but the *last* state of Hellenic letters, the one that survived and displaced a host of rival alphabets, as at Athens after the Archonship of Eukleides (403-2 B.C.). This Ionian alphabet was that used in Asia, where it early asserted itself at the

πρὶν Ἕλλησι ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, πρῶτα μὲν τοῖσι καὶ ἅπαντες χρέωνται Φοίνικες· μετὰ δὲ χρόνου προβαίνοντος ἅμα τῇ φωνῇ μετέβαλλον καὶ τὸν ῥυθμὸν τῶν γραμμάτων. περιοίκεον δέ σφεας τὰ πολλὰ [τῶν χώρων] τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἑλλήνων Ἴωνες, οἳ παραλαβόντες διδαχῇ παρὰ τῶν Φοινίκων τὰ γράμματα, μεταρρυθμίσαντές σφεων ὀλίγα ἐχρέωντο, χρεώμενοι δὲ ἐφάτισαν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἔφερε, ἐσαγαγόντων Φοινίκων ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, Φοινικήια κεκλῆσθαι. καὶ τὰς βύβλους διφθέρας καλέουσι ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ οἱ Ἴωνες, ὅτι κοτὲ ἐν σπάνι βύβλων ἐχρέωντο διφθέρῃσι αἰγέῃσί τε καὶ οἰέῃσι· ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ
59 πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐς τοιαύτας διφθέρας γράφουσι. εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Καδμήια γράμματα ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ

---

expense of any other, and was employed for example in Hdt.'s native city in his own day. (Halikarnassian inscription, Hicks, *Manual*, No. 21.) Whether it was locally a product and modification of the absolutely first Greek alphabet, this being neither of European nor of Nesiote, but of Asiatic-Ionian origin, may perhaps be an open question. In any case Hdt.'s statement that the authors of the distinctively Greek alphabet (or alphabets) were Ionians is probably true; at least as against a 'Dorian' claim. For, though Thera passed in the fifth century for 'Dorian,' the validity of that theory is extremely doubtful. See 4. 147. Hdt. makes two other observations on Greek writing: 2. 36 where he states that Greek writing went from right to left, without noticing the other archaic methods; 1. 139 where he seems to indicate the co-existence of different sibilant symbols in the older alphabets. Cp. Roberts, *op. c. supra*, p. 9. Whether the Hellenes, or inhabitants of the Peninsula, even before the coming of the Phoenicians, or of the Dorians, had alphabets, is a question which the present state of the evidence hardly raises, much less solves: and even if solved in the affirmative, the Phoenician origin of the historic alphabet would probably remain unaffected.

5. **φωνῇ.** Their native (Semitic) language; on the word cp. 4. 114.

6. **ῥυθμός,** figure, form = σχῆμα, Aristot. *Metaph.* 1. 4, 985b, cp. *de mirab.* 133, 843b.

περιοίκεον. In Euboea, Attica, Peloponnesos, the islands. Probably Hdt. is right substantially: for the Ionians were the first of the distinctly Hellenic stocks to have extensive dealings with the Phoenicians, as appears from the Semitic name for the Greeks, *i.e.* *Jawan*. **τῶν χώρων** *del.* Krüger.

9. **μεταρρυθμίσαντες.** Hdt. on an obscure subject sometimes grows obscure in his expressions, as here, cp. 6. 57. He has just said that the Phoenicians who entered Greece changed their language, and modified their letters. Now he says the Ionians modified the letters they learned from the Phoenicians. It is not clear whether he thinks the Ionians modified still further letters already modified by the (Hellenised) Phoenicians, or whether he thinks that the Ionians were the first to change the letters.

11. **Φοινικήια,** as Stein observes, is here a substantive.

κεκλῆσθαι may be regarded as redundant, but idiomatic, cp. c. 68 *infra ad fin.*

12. **ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ . . κοτέ.** Before the opening of Egypt to the Ionians *c.* 650 B.C., 2. 156, the Ionians may have used skins (pergament, parchment), which were afterwards superseded, though not wholly, by the cheaper material.

13. **τὸ κατ' ἐμέ.** It may be inferred from this passage that Hdt.'s own work was written on papyros.

14. **πολλοί** is perhaps an exaggeration. Ktesias mentions the Persian Archives as διφθέραι βασιλικαί. See L. & S. *s. v.* On the subject of ancient books: see Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, Berlin, 1882, Iwan Müller, *Handbuch*, i. 307 ff., Maunde Thompson, *Gk. and Lat. Palaeography* (1893), cc. ii. iii. v.

59. 2. **αὐτός.** We have in this chapter evidence of a visit to Thebes, cp. Introduction, pp. lxxxii, xciv.

Ἰσμηνίου ἐν Θήβῃσι τῇσι Βοιωτῶν, ἐπὶ τρίποσί τισι ἐγκεκολαμμένα, τὰ πολλὰ ὅμοια ἐόντα τοῖσι Ἰωνικοῖσι. ὁ μὲν δὴ εἷς τῶν τριπόδων ἐπίγραμμα ἔχει

Ἀμφιτρύων μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἐὼν ἀπὸ Τηλεβοάων.

ταῦτα ἡλικίην εἴη ἂν κατὰ Λάιον τὸν Λαβδάκου τοῦ Πολυδώρου
τοῦ Κάδμου. ἕτερος δὲ τρίπους ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ λέγει 60

Σκαῖος πυγμαχέων με ἑκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι
νικήσας ἀνέθηκε τεῒν περικαλλὲς ἄγαλμα.

Σκαῖος δ' ἂν εἴη ὁ Ἱπποκόωντος, εἰ δὴ οὗτός γέ ἐστι ὁ ἀναθεὶς καὶ μὴ ἄλλος τὠυτὸ οὔνομα ἔχων τῷ Ἱπποκόωντος, ἡλικίην κατὰ
Οἰδίπουν τὸν Λαΐου. τρίτος δὲ τρίπους λέγει καὶ οὗτος ἐν 61
ἑξαμέτρῳ

Λαοδάμας τρίποδ' αὐτὸς ἐυσκόπῳ Ἀπόλλωνι
μουναρχέων ἀνέθηκε τεῒν περικαλλὲς ἄγαλμα.

γράμματα. It has generally been concluded that these inscriptions were unauthentic: for Hdt. seems to assume that in the days of Laïos and of Oidipus the inhabitants of Thebes not merely spake and wrote good Greek, but even composed their inscriptions in Hexameter verse. According to his own chronological scheme, if we may attempt to rationalise one for him, this would set the origin of Greek writing as far back as 1500 B.C. (cp. 4. 147). It is of course possible that the objects, on which the inscriptions were to be read, were much older than the inscriptions themselves. As Rawlinson remarks: "The inscription can at best only have expressed the belief of the priests as to the person who dedicated the tripod." Hicks (*Manual of Gk. Inscr.* p. 2) follows Bergk in dismissing these inscriptions as hardly earlier than the seventh cent. But perhaps Hdt. did not mean that the very words he gives were inscribed or legible on the *anathemata*: he may be giving a proposed version of archaic inscriptions. Cp. the story of the ancient *Stele* found at Hypate, the inscription on which was interpreted by comparison with certain *anathemata* in the Ismenion. Aristot. *de mirab.* 133, 843b.

ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ. Of the two rivers of Thebes the Ismenos was the one to the east. The temple may have been situate on the hill above the stream, and to the east of the Kadmeia (cp. *Dict. Geogr.* ii. 1151 ff.). E. Fabricius, *Theben*, Freiburg im B. 1890, p. 22 and plan, identifies the Ismenion with the hill of S. Luke (after Ulrichs, cp. Baedeker's *Greece*, 1889, p. 175).

3. **τῇσι Βοιωτῶν.** As distinguished from Egyptian Thebes. The mention of *βύβλος* just before may have led to this particular, rather than the mention of the Kadmeians.

6. *Amphitryon*, the human father of Herakles. Cp. 6. 53.

ἐὼν is doubtful. The passage has been variously emended: *ἰὼν* (bad); *ἐόντ'* Valckenaer; *νέων* Bentley; *νήσων ἄπο* Bergk. Stein suggests *ἀνέθηκε θεῷ*. Why not *ἀνέθηκε τεῒν*, if L. & S. are right in marking the iota long?

ἀπό, "e praeda" (Stein). A usage not noticed by L. & S. (for I. 6 will not cover this), but established by the instances quoted by Stein. Simonid. *Fr.* 137, Aischines *c. Ktesiph.* 116, Pausan. 1. 13, 3, 5. 10, 4.

60. 2. **Σκαῖος.** Skaios, one of the sons of Hippokoon, apparently helped his father to drive Tyndareus out of Lakedaimon, before his marriage with Leda, and was afterwards slain with his father and brothers by Herakles, who restored Tyndareus. Apollodor. *Bibliotheca*, 3. 5. Hdt. may well have doubts as to the donor's identity with Skaios son of Hippokoon.

61. 2. **ἑξαμέτρῳ.** *τόνῳ* seems to have dropped out. Stein[6] reads it.

ἐπὶ τούτου δὴ τοῦ Λαοδάμαντος τοῦ Ἐτεοκλέος μουναρχέοντος ἐξανιστέαται Καδμεῖοι ὑπ' Ἀργείων καὶ τράπονται ἐς τοὺς Ἐγχελέας. οἱ δὲ Γεφυραῖοι ὑπολειφθέντες ὕστερον ὑπὸ Βοιωτῶν ἀναχωρέουσι ἐς Ἀθήνας· καί σφι ἱρά ἐστι ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ἱδρυμένα, τῶν οὐδὲν μέτα τοῖσι λοιποῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι, ἄλλα τε κεχωρισμένα τῶν ἄλλων ἱρῶν καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀχαιίης Δήμητρος ἱρόν τε καὶ ὄργια.

62 Ἡ μὲν δὴ ὄψις τοῦ Ἱππάρχου ἐνυπνίου καὶ οἱ Γεφυραῖοι ὅθεν ἐγεγόνεσαν, τῶν ἦσαν οἱ Ἱππάρχου φονέες, ἀπήγηταί μοι· δεῖ δὲ πρὸς τούτοισι ἔτι ἀναλαβεῖν τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς ἤια λέξων λόγον, ὡς τυράννων ἐλευθερώθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι. Ἱππίεω τυραννεύοντος καὶ ἐμπικραινομένου Ἀθηναίοισι διὰ τὸν Ἱππάρχου θάνατον, Ἀλκμεωνίδαι γένος ἐόντες Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ φεύγοντες

---

6. **ὑπ' Ἀργείων.** The Epigoni, Laodamas himself being slain by Alkmaion, the leader. Apollodor. *Bibliotheca*, 3. 7, 2. 3. According to this authority the Thebans fled and founded Hestiaea.

Ἐγχελέας. As Rawlinson remarks *ad l.* "There was a legend that Cadmus assisted them against the other Illyrians (Apollod. III. v. 4). Hence perhaps it was thought likely that the Cadmeians would take refuge with them," *i.e.* we have here not tradition but rationalism.

7. **Γεφυραῖοι.** The Gephyraeans at Tanagra appear here almost co-ordinate with the Kadmeians at Thebes. Originally united they are ultimately driven apart, north (west) and south. Thuc. 1. 12 dates the Boeotian invasion sixty years after the Trojan war. It was doubtless connected with the tribal migrations which brought the Dorians into Peloponnesos.

9. **κεχωρισμένα.** The separate cultus no doubt points, as Hdt. rightly suggests, to a difference of origin and kinship. Later political union did not wholly obliterate such traces and survivals, even in Attica. Cp. c. 66 *infra*. 'Achaian' Demeter is Demeter of the Lamentations (Etym. M. *sub v.*): the Hellenic Mater Dolorosa: but not necessarily the same as Γεφυραία Δημήτηρ (Demeter of the Bridge, Et. M. *s.v.* Γεφυρεῖς). This shrine of Achaian Demeter was presumably in Aphidnae, *vide* c. 57 *supra*.

62. 3. **κατ' ἀρχάς** refers back merely to c. 55 where Hdt. started the λόγος, ὡς τυράννων ἐλευθερώθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι, arrested by two previous digressions: (1) on the dream of Hipparchos, (2) on the origin of the Gephyraeans. On the formula, cp. 4. 82, and Introduction, § 20 (1).

6. **γένος ἐόντες Ἀθηναῖοι.** Not like the Peisistratidae, who were notoriously ἐπήλυδες like the Gephyraeans, cp. c. 65 *infra*. However, another tradition exactly reversed this view, making the Alkmaionidae ἐπήλυδες, and leaving the origin of the Peisistratidae at least an open question (Pausanias 2. 18, 9). Indeed, this tradition traced the Alkmaionidae to Neleus and Nestor. A unison of these discords may be effected in three ways: (1) by supposing that both the Peisistratidae and the Alkmaionidae were immigrants, and indeed relatives: in which case the repudiation of the relationship has to be explained. (2) By supposing that neither the one nor the other were immigrants, but both alike native Athenians: in which case the theories of their foreign origin remain to be explained. (3) By supposing that one was, and one was not, of foreign extraction: in which case the false claim remains to be explained in each case. Petersen, *Quaestiones etc.*, prefers (2) and explains away the foreign origin hypothesis by ascribing it to an ambition to connect the great families of Athens with the great families of Peloponnesos. But he admits that the tradition of the Peloponnesian origin of the Alkmaionidae is the older tradition, and he dismisses too easily the memories of immigration into Attica. Few pretensions are more transparent fictions than the claim of the Athenians, in the fifth century B.C., to be children of the soil, free of all foreign taint, Ionian, Pelasgian, and

Πεισιστρατίδας, ἐπείτε σφι ἅμα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἀθηναίων φυγάσι πειρωμένοισι κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν οὐ προεχώρεε [κάτοδος], ἀλλὰ προσέπταιον μεγάλως πειρώμενοι κατιέναι τε καὶ ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας, Λειψύδριον τὸ ὑπὲρ Παιονίης τειχίσαντες, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι πᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδῃσι μηχανώμενοι παρ' Ἀμφικτυόνων τὸν νηὸν μισθοῦνται τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖσι, τὸν νῦν ἐόντα τότε δὲ οὔκω, τοῦτον ἐξοικοδομῆσαι. οἷα δὲ χρημάτων εὖ ἥκοντες καὶ ἐόντες ἄνδρες δόκιμοι ἀνέκαθεν ἔτι, τόν τε νηὸν ἐξεργάσαντο τοῦ παραδείγματος κάλλιον τά τε ἄλλα καὶ συγκειμένου σφι πωρίνου λίθου ποιέειν τὸν νηόν, Παρίου τὰ ἔμπροσθε

---

such like. (3) would lead to the conclusion that the Peisistratidae were Ionian immigrants, and the Alkmaionidae the native stock. But, as Petersen points out, the tradition of the foreign origin of the Alkmaionidae can scarcely be later than Hdt., rather does our author appear to be expressly combating and denying such a view. We are thus driven back to (1). Both families were foreign, *i.e.* from the Peloponnesos, and perhaps related. The Peisistratidae proudly preserved this family tradition. The Alkmaionidae repudiated it, owing probably to their quarrel with Peisistratos and his sons, and put themselves at the head of an Athenian movement before the end of the sixth century, which involved the negation of all foreign claims and elements, Peloponnesian, Ionian, Pelasgian, and the assertion of the indigenous primitive earth-born character of the whole Athenian and Attic population. Cp. cc. 66, 69 *infra*. Thucydides with his more systematic rationalism tries to be just to the rival views, recognising the foreign extraction of the great families, yet asserting the autochthonous origin of the masses. Nor is this view perhaps far from the truth. Thuc. 1. 2.

φεύγοντες, 1. 64.

8. **κάτοδος** *del.* Krüger.

9. **ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας.** It was not left to the moderns, or even to the Romans, to perpetrate crimes in the name of liberty. The sincerity of the passion for 'liberty' of the Alkmaionidae may be gauged by their understanding and alliance with Peisistratos 1. 60, their friendship and obligations to Kroisos 6. 125 *infra*, and Kleisthenes of Sikyon, 6. 126 ff. Cp. 6. 115, 121 *infra* on the charge of Medism against them in 490 B.C.

10. **Λειψύδριον τὸ ὑπὲρ Παιονίης.** The Ἀθην. πολ. 19. 3 (ed. Sandys) has *Λειψύδριον τὸ ὑπὲρ Πάρνηθος*. There was no place named Paionia in Attica: there was a deme Paiania (*Παιανία*) east of Hymettos, in the Mesogaea, and there was a deme Paionidae (*Παιονίδαι*) south of Parnes, in the valley of the Kephisos. The fort was probably *upon* Parnes, and *above* Paionidae. Hdt.'s description is based on a confusion of *Παιονίδαι* and *Παιανία*, and the text of the Ἀθ. π. is probably an intentional correction, based on more accurate knowledge of Attic topography.

12. **Ἀμφικτυόνων.** The Amphictyonic council and the Delphic oracle were to be worked against the Peisistratidae. The temple had been burnt down in 548 B.C. on which occasion the Golden Lion of Kroisos suffered some injury 1. 50. The estimate fixed by the council for the rebuilding was 300 T. and the money was raised by donations from various quarters, including Egypt, 2. 180. The exiled Alkmaionidae seem to have undertaken to complete (*ἐξοικοδομῆσαι*) the structure, which may have been at a stand for want of funds. As gratitude is a short-lived faculty, probably this act of the Alkmaionidae was not long previous to the expulsion of the Peisistratidae. It was still pursued with envy (*φθόνος*) in 490 B.C. when Pindar wrote the (seventh) Pythian Epinikion in honour of Megakles: and half a century later it was the chief title of his children to fame.

13. **χρημάτων.** Thanks to their relations with Kroisos. But cp. 6. 125. The Ἀθ. πολ. implies that they made a good thing of their contract with Delphi (*ὅθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων* 19. 4).

14. **ἄνδρες δόκιμοι ἀνέκαθεν ἔτι.** Cp. the words in 6. 125.

16. **Παρίου.** Parian marble was of

63 αὐτοῦ ἐξεποίησαν. ὡς ὦν δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, οὗτοι οἱ ἄνδρες ἐν Δελφοῖσι κατήμενοι ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην χρήμασι, ὅκως ἔλθοιεν Σπαρτιητέων ἄνδρες εἴτε ἰδίῳ στόλῳ εἴτε δημοσίῳ χρησόμενοι, προφέρειν σφι τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλευθεροῦν. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δέ, ὥς σφι αἰεὶ τὠυτὸ πρόφαντον ἐγίνετο, πέμπουσι Ἀγχιμόλιον τὸν Ἀστέρος, ἐόντα τῶν ἀστῶν ἄνδρα δόκιμον, σὺν στρατῷ ἐξελῶντα Πεισιστρατίδας ἐξ Ἀθηνέων ὅμως καὶ ξεινίους σφι ἐόντας τὰ μάλιστα· τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβύτερα ἐποιεῦντο ἢ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν· πέμπουσι δὲ τούτους κατὰ θάλασσαν πλοίοισι. ὁ μὲν δὴ προσσχὼν ἐς Φάληρον τὴν στρατιὴν ἀπέβησε, οἱ δὲ Πεισιστρατίδαι προπυνθανόμενοι ταῦτα ἐπεκαλέοντο ἐκ Θεσσαλίης ἐπικουρίην· ἐπεποίητο γάρ σφι συμμαχίη πρὸς αὐτούς. Θεσσαλοὶ δέ σφι δεομένοισι ἀπέπεμψαν κοινῇ γνώμῃ χρεώμενοι

---

course much more splendid than porine (tufa) stone. Cp. 3. 57, 6. 133.

63. 1. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. Other than the Alkmaionidae. Schweighäuser conjectured *Λακεδαιμόνιοι*. But there were plenty of people in Athens who had no illusions about the Alkmaionidae, cp. 6. 115. Still as we have now in the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, c. 19, what is obviously an Athenian version of the whole affair (cp. Appendix IX. § 4), the discovery supports and verifies the conjecture of Schweighäuser.

2. τὴν Πυθίην. The Pythia was not above suspicion, cp. 6. 66, though whether a douceur to the prophetess alone would have had the desired effect may be fairly doubted. It may also be thought that the Delphic authorities would have needed very little inducement to preach a crusade against the Peisistratidae, whose pieties looked in other directions, *vide* c. 56 *supra*, and whose pomps and buildings were not calculated to further the special interests of Delphi. The Ἀθ. πολ. seems to suggest that the Alkmaionids spent money at Sparta (*πρὸς τὴν τῶν Λακώνων βοήθειαν* 19. 4).

6. τῶν ἀστῶν ἄνδρα δόκιμον. Like Eurybiades the navarch in 480 B.C. Cp. 8. 42. Anchimolios is the first Spartan commander, other than the kings, whose name we know, although the expedition to overthrow Polykrates was no doubt under similar command, 3. 54 ff. The fact that these first expeditions are by sea may perhaps explain the absence of the king.

7. ξεινίους . . τὰ μάλιστα. The Spartans had no objection to an alliance with 'tyranny' when it suited their own interests. But 'tyranny' at Athens (or Sardes, or Susa, or Syracuse) was one thing: in Sparta, or even in Peloponnese, another. It was not, according to the Lakedaimonians, on political grounds that they expelled the Peisistratidae, but on religious, 'putting the god before the men.' Athenian tradition saw in the Argive alliance a political motive. Ἀθ. πολ. 19. Policy indeed afterwards led the Spartans to project a restoration, cc. 90 ff. *infra*. Statecraft was far more highly developed in and after "the age of the Despots" than Hdt. appears to realise.

10. Φάληρον. At that time still of course the harbour: cp. 6. 116.

12. συμμαχίη. Peisistratos and his sons were like most tyrants good politicians and paid special attention to foreign affairs. The Thessalian alliance was only one of a number designed to cooperate and secure the régime: as with Lygdamis of Naxos, 1. 64, Amyntas of Macedon, c. 94 *infra*, Hippoklos of Lampsakos, cp. 4. 138, Thuc. 6. 59, the Argives, Ἀθ. πολ. 19. The connexion between Athens and Thessaly remained a permanent idea of democratic Athens: and if the Thessalians *κοινῇ γνώμῃ* had sent to support the Athenian tyrant (*c.* 511 B.C.) in Hdt.'s own time the Athenian democracy had attempted the restoration of Orestes in Thessaly (B.C. 554, Thuc. 1. 111).

χιλίην τε ἵππον καὶ τὸν βασιλέα τὸν σφέτερον Κινέην ἄνδρα Κονιαῖον· τοὺς ἐπείτε ἔσχον συμμάχους οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι, ἐμηχανῶντο τοιάδε· κείραντες τῶν Φαληρέων τὸ πεδίον καὶ ἱππάσιμον ποιήσαντες τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον ἐπῆκαν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τὴν ἵππον· ἐμπεσοῦσα δὲ διέφθειρε ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸν Ἀγχιμόλιον· τοὺς δὲ περιγενομένους αὐτῶν ἐς τὰς νέας κατεῖρξαν. ὁ μὲν δὴ πρῶτος στόλος ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος οὕτω ἀπήλλαξε, καὶ Ἀγχιμολίου εἰσὶ ταφαὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀλωπεκῆσι, ἀγχοῦ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ ἐν Κυνοσάργεϊ.

64 Μετὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέζω στόλον στείλαντες ἀπέπεμψαν ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας, στρατηγὸν τῆς στρατιῆς ἀποδέξαντες βασιλέα Κλεομένεα τὸν Ἀναξανδρίδεω, οὐκέτι κατὰ θάλασσαν στείλαντες ἀλλὰ κατ' ἤπειρον· τοῖσι ἐσβαλοῦσι ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν χώρην ἡ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ἵππος πρώτη προσέμιξε καὶ οὐ μετὰ πολλὸν ἐτράπετο, καί σφεων ἔπεσον ὑπὲρ τεσσεράκοντα ἄνδρας· οἱ δὲ περιγενόμενοι ἀπαλλάσσοντο ὡς εἶχον εὐθὺς ἐπὶ Θεσσαλίης.

---

16. **ἐμηχανῶντο.** Blakesley has pointed out, and Rawlinson has admitted, some difficulty in envisaging or rationalising the military situation and movements described in this chapter. It is not easy to understand why Anchimolios was buried at Alopekai unless he fell there: if he fell there, he must have advanced off the Phalerian plain, and past the city, for Alopekai lay between Lykabettos and the Ilissos. (Smith, *Geogr. Dict.* i. 327б, cp. Curtius and Kaupert, *Atlas v. Athen*, Blatt ii.) In that case the Thessalian horse would have been between the Lakedaimonians and the sea, and any survivors who reached their ships could only have done so by bursting through the lines of the Athenians and Thessalians. It is, however, very easy to invent hypotheses to explain this difficulty, admitting that Anchimolios fought and fell at Alopekai. To take the most obvious: the Spartans must have left on the strand a force to guard the ships. The narrative is curt and inadequate, but there is nothing self-contradictory or inexplicable in it.

22. **Ἡρακλείου.** It was here that the Athenians halted after their forced march from Marathon, 6. 116. The spot no doubt commanded a view of Phaleron and the offing, or at least such a view can be obtained from Lykabettos. The Herakleion would hardly perhaps have been specified here as a topographical fixture, but for the notoriety it had obtained in connexion with the Marathonian campaign. The passage suggests, though it does not prove, autopsy. Cp. Introduction, pp. lx f. The idiomatic plural ταφαί is observable.

64. 1. **μετά.** The Lakedaimonians had now a defeat to avenge, or at least a disgrace to obliterate, for this expedition is marked distinctly as a separate and subsequent act, and we must not suppose that the troops under Kleomenes were intended to co-operate with the force of Anchimolios. But cp. 6. 76, for an instance of such strategy.

2. **ἀποδέξαντες.** Did the king then require to be appointed to the command? Such an implication may seem to conflict with the story cc. 74 ff. *infra*, and with the alleged prerogatives 6. 56, but it is the regular course of procedure, at least in later times: cp. Xen. *Hell.* 4. 2, 9, 6. 4, 18, 6. 5, 10, and cp. 9. 10 *infra*. The general rule no doubt was to appoint one of the kings to command: this passage shows that this rule cannot date merely from the quarrel of Kleomenes and Demaratos, c. 75 *infra*.

7. **ἀπαλλάσσοντο.** The engagement would have taken place on the Thriasian plain, and the Thessalians may have ridden by Eleutherae and Dryoskephalae over Kithairon homewards, cp. 9. 19.

Κλεομένης δὲ ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὸ ἄστυ ἅμα Ἀθηναίων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἐπολιόρκεε τοὺς τυράννους ἀπεργμέ-
65 νους ἐν τῷ Πελασγικῷ τείχεϊ. καὶ οὐδέν τι πάντως ἂν ἐξεῖλον Πεισιστρατίδας οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι· οὔτε γὰρ ἐπέδρην ἐπενόεον ποιήσασθαι, οἵ τε Πεισιστρατίδαι σίτοισι καὶ ποτοῖσι εὖ παρεσκευάδατο, πολιορκήσαντές τε ἂν ἡμέρας ὀλίγας ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην· νῦν δὲ συντυχίη τοῖσι μὲν κακὴ ἐπεγένετο, τοῖσι δὲ ἡ αὐτὴ αὕτη σύμμαχος· ὑπεκτιθέμενοι γὰρ ἔξω τῆς χώρης οἱ παῖδες τῶν Πεισιστρατιδέων ἥλωσαν. τοῦτο δὲ ὡς ἐγένετο, πάντα αὐτῶν τὰ πρήγματα συνετετάρακτο, παρέστησαν δὲ ἐπὶ μισθῷ τοῖσι τέκνοισι, ἐπ᾽ οἷσι ἐβούλοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὥστε ἐν πέντε ἡμέρῃσι ἐκχωρῆσαι ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς. μετὰ δὲ ἐξεχώρησαν

---

8. **Ἀθηναίων.** There was a party in Athens working against the Peisistratidae.

9. **τοὺς τυράννους.** The plural might mean simply 'Hippias and his house,' but there is, perhaps, an element of feeling in it: *uno avulso non deficit alter.* Cp. also c. 55 *supra.*

10. **τῷ Πελασγικῷ τείχεϊ.** The old wall round the Akropolis, 6. 137, within which probably the Peisistratidae had their dwelling, cp. Pausan. 1. 28, 3 *τῇ δὲ ἀκροπόλει πλὴν ὅσον Κίμων ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτῆς ὁ Μιλτιάδου, περιβαλεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν λέγεται τοῦ τείχους Πελασγοὺς οἰκήσαντάς ποτε ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.* Cp. Curtius, *Stadtgesch. v. Athen*, lxxvi. p. 68, Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments*, pp. 535 ff. (The correct form of the word seems to be *Πελαργικόν.*) The question arises: how, if Athens was at that time a walled city, the Spartans managed to pass the gates? The existence of the party of 'Liberators' just referred to might suggest a solution of this difficulty: the Akropolis was held by the Peisistratidae against citizen and foreigner alike. Yet the doubt whether Athens was a walled city recurs in connexion with the story of Marathon, and the story of Salamis, and the accumulated doubts have led Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to answer the question in the negative, *Aus Kydathen*, pp. 97 ff. The problem is described by Curtius (*Stadtg.* p. 90) as one of the most difficult in the history of the city. There are three arguments for a wall: (1) Themistokles is said to have rebuilt and enlarged the walls, Thuc. 1. 89 ff. (2) Hipparchos was assassinated in the Kerameikos: the assassins entered through the Gates: Thuc. 6. 57. (3) The Gate of Hadrian marks a point in a prae-Themistoklean city-wall. Curtius proposes therefore a compromise. He ascribes to the tyrants an intention, partially carried out, to build a city-wall of about 20 stades in circumference. But this compromise is hardly satisfactory. Why the old ring-wall can only belong to the age of the despots (ein solcher kann nur der Tyrannenzeit angehören, *op. c.* p. 90), is not self-evident. The despotic family or dynasty would be better able to hold a citadel than a fortified city, and as likely to destroy as to build a wall of 20 stades circumference: though they might have left old gateways standing. In any case, if there was a wall, it might have been built before the age of Peisistratos: but it can hardly have been effective in the days of Marathon. Cp. 6. 109.

65. 1. **ἄν.** The protasis of this sentence is not grammatically expressed, but is materially contained in what follows (*εἰ μὴ συντυχίη κτλ. οὐκ ἂν ἐξεῖλον*). The narrative gains in rhetorical force by the transition out of the conditional, effected by *νῦν δέ.* How Hdt. knows so well that but for an accident the Lakedaimonians would have failed, does not appear. It is presumably an inference: and might have been qualified (*δοκέειν ἐμοί.* Cp. Introduction, § 22).

6. **ὑπεκτιθέμενοι**, 'in the act of being secretly conveyed out.'

8. **συνετετάρακτο.** The tense is rhetorical. *μισθῷ* and *τέκνοισι* are in apposition, and *οἷσι* has nothing to say to either. The whole chapter reads as if the exciting moment of the Regifuge were too much for Hdt.'s grammar.

ἐς Σίγειον τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ Σκαμάνδρῳ, ἄρξαντες μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἐπ' ἔτεα ἓξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα, ἐόντες δὲ καὶ οὗτοι ἀνέκαθεν Πύλιοί τε καὶ Νηλεῖδαι, ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γεγονότες καὶ οἱ ἀμφὶ Κόδρον τε καὶ Μέλανθον, οἳ πρότερον ἐπήλυδες ἐόντες ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίων βασιλέες. ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ καὶ τὠυτὸ οὔνομα ἀπεμνημόνευσε Ἱπποκράτης τῷ παιδὶ θέσθαι τὸν Πεισίστρατον, ἐπὶ τοῦ Νέστορος Πεισιστράτου ποιεύμενος τὴν ἐπωνυμίην.

Οὕτω μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι τυράννων ἀπαλλάχθησαν· ὅσα δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἔρξαν ἢ ἔπαθον ἀξιόχρεα ἀπηγήσιος, πρὶν ἢ Ἰωνίην τε ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Δαρείου καὶ Ἀρισταγόρεα τὸν Μιλήσιον ἀπικόμενον ἐς Ἀθήνας χρηίσαι σφέων βοηθέειν, ταῦτα πρῶτα φράσω.

Ἀθῆναι, ἐοῦσαι καὶ πρὶν μεγάλαι, τότε ἀπαλλαχθεῖσαι 66
τυράννων ἐγίνοντο μέζονες· ἐν δὲ αὐτῇσι δύο ἄνδρες ἐδυνάστευον, Κλεισθένης τε ἀνὴρ Ἀλκμεωνίδης, ὅς περ δὴ λόγον ἔχει τὴν Πυθίην ἀναπεῖσαι, καὶ Ἰσαγόρης Τισάνδρου οἰκίης μὲν ἐὼν

---

11. **Σίγειον**, c. 94 *infra*, cp. Thuc. 6. 59, 4 *ἐχώρει (Ἱππίας) ἔς τε Σίγειον καὶ παρ' Αἰαντίδην ἐς Λάμψακον κτλ.*, which would seem to imply that Aiantides had by this time succeeded his father Hippoklos, cp. c. 63 *supra*.

12. **ἔτεα ἓξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα**, *i.e.* thirty-six years of actual power, excluding the years of exile. The Ἀθ. πολ. c. 19 gives the Archon's name, Harpaktides (which may therefore be placed for the year 511-510 B.C.) and the duration of the tyranny as seventeen years from the death of Peisistratos, and forty-nine in all. These figures are not based exclusively upon Hdt., for they are more precise than his data. The forty-nine years include the periods of exile: and there is no conflict between the data in Hdt. and in the Ἀθ. πολ. Discrepancies only come in with Aristotle, *Pol.* 8. 12, 5, 1315b. The passage, however, is perhaps interpolated.

καὶ οὗτοι, as well as the Kodridae. The connexion helps to explain the *Ionism* of Peisistratos: cp. 1. 147.

15. **ἐπὶ τούτου . . τὸν Πεισίστρατον, ἐπὶ τοῦ Νέστορος Πεισιστράτου . .** The grammar is not as lucid as might be wished. *τούτου* may be taken as neuter, and *τὸν* Π. as appositive and exegetical of *οὔνομα*. With *ἐπὶ τούτου* cp. *ἐπὶ τοῦδε* 7. 40, 83, *ἐπὶ τούτου* 7. 193, *ἐπὶ τοῦδε* 2. 57 (Stein). But the cases are not exact parallels to the expression here, as in them the neuter genitive is followed (or preceded) by a demonstrative sentence, here by a repetition of the preposition with a personal name.

18. **ὅσα κτλ.** This sentence marks very clearly a stage in the narrative, and perhaps a change in the sources. *ὅσα* is a large promise, and should leave nothing to be desired. Hdt. offers what follows as a complete account of Athenian history from 510-500 B.C.

66. 1. **καὶ πρὶν μεγάλαι.** Kroisos when directed to form a *μεγάλη συμμαχία* (*circa* 550 B.C.) had preferred Sparta to Athens, 1. 69, but since the days of Peisistratos, his wars (1. 59, c. 94 *infra*) and alliances (c. 63 *supra*), Athens might be reckoned as one of the 'great' (Hellenic) powers, though possibly unknown to the Persian, c. 105 *infra*. The *καὶ πρὶν* presumably refers to the period of the tyranny, and hardly squares with 1. 59, 65. Anyway the increase or revival of power is antedated: probably the immediate effect of the expulsion of the Peisistratids was to weaken the power of Athens.

3. **Κλεισθένης.** His origin and history are more fully set forth 6. 126-131.

λόγον ἔχει. Cp. *αἰτίην ἔχειν* cc. 70, 73 *infra*.

τὴν Πυθίην, c. 63 *supra*.

4. **Τισάνδρου.** Tisandros is father

δοκίμου, ἀτὰρ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι· θύουσι δὲ οἱ συγγενέες αὐτοῦ Διὶ Καρίῳ. οὗτοι οἱ ἄνδρες ἐστασίασαν περὶ δυνάμιος, ἑσσούμενος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὸν δῆμον προσεταιρίζεται. μετὰ δὲ τετραφύλους ἐόντας Ἀθηναίους δεκαφύλους ἐποίησε, τῶν Ἴωνος παίδων Γελέοντος καὶ Αἰγικόρεος καὶ Ἀργάδεω καὶ Ὅπλητος ἀπαλλάξας τὰς ἐπωνυμίας, ἐξευρὼν δὲ ἑτέρων ἡρώων

---

of Hippokleides, an undoubted Philaid, who was *τὰ ἀνέκαθεν* related to the Kypselids of Corinth, see 6. 128; but we cannot argue therefrom that this Isagoras belonged to the Philaidae: the notice here rather points to an opposite conclusion: even though the passage in Bk. 6 may be a late addition. The Ἀθ. πολ. c. 20 describes Isagoras as *φίλος ὢν τῶν τυράννων*, meaning the Peisistratids, which is unlikely. If by 'Karian Zeus' were meant the Zeus Stratios or Labrandeus worshipped by the Karians (*vide* c. 119 *infra*) the statement would go to show that Isagoras was of Karian ancestry. It would, however, be astonishing to find a pure Karian stock at home in Athens. We need not go further than Megara for the cradle of the family. The Megaraian akropolis was called Karia (Pausan. 1. 40, 6) and Zeus was there worshipped: though in Pausanias' time it was 'Olympian' Zeus.

6. **περὶ δυνάμιος**, 'political power.' The struggle was probably over the elections to the Archonship, still the highest office, cp. Ἀθ. πολ. c. 13. An Isagoras was the Archon 508-7 B.C. See Clinton, *F. H. ad ann.* and to the year of Isagoras the Reforms of Kleisthenes are dated by the Ἀθ. πολ. c. 21.

7. **ἑσσούμενος.** Kleisthenes and his relatives must have returned immediately upon the expulsion of the Peisistratidae. Their long absence might help to explain their getting the worst of the ensuing political struggle. It is surely an anachronism when the Ἀθ. π. ascribes the defeat of Kleisthenes to the 'clubs' (*ἑταιρείαις*), but may have been partially suggested by the *προσεταιρίζεται* here. For the verb cp. 3. 70, for the substantive c. 71 *infra*.

τὸν δῆμον, not of course his own party, with which he was already in partnership, much less the party of Isagoras, but the headless and disorganised party of the Peisistratidae. Cp. 1. 59.

9. **Ἴωνος.** That these divisions are 'Ionian' and not 'Attic' should now be recognised. Rawlinson calls them "ancient hereditary tribes of Attica"; Duncker definitely regards Attica as their cradle, and speaks of them habitually as the 'Attic Phylae.' But unless we are to believe not merely that the Ionian cities in Asia, but also that the Ionians of the Peloponnese and elsewhere, really were colonies of Athens, we must conclude that this system was common to Ionians, and that the abolition of the system for political purposes at Athens was part of a general anti-Ionian movement. The weight of tradition or ancient theory is in favour of some such conclusion. The Phylae are closely attached to Ion: they are never called 'Attic' by any ancient writer: but as Ion was provided for in Attica, the *Phylae* are there attached to the soil. It suited Athens from time to time to reassert her solidarity with the Ionians; the 'metropolitan' idea was emphasised in the fifth century, and Athens took the place of Miletos as the *πρόσχημα τῆς Ἰωνίης* in the larger sense: but to regard Attica as the cradle of the Ionian stock and the Ionian *Phylae* as originally Attic, generalised by the colonial diffusion, is to be more Ionian than the Ionians or Athenians themselves ever were. However, even if it were admitted that Attica was the first home of the Ionians, and that the four *Phylae* came into existence there first, this would not make them 'Attic' as distinct from 'Ionian.' Attica is not a genetic but a local designation, and cannot be the *summum genus* of genetic divisions. Such an expression as Hdt. uses 1. 59 *τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος* is obviously unscientific, and belongs to a time when the political unification of Attica had given a sort of 'ethnic' unity to all Athenians. Its application to the Athenians of the age of Kroisos is something of an anachronism.

10. **τὰς ἐπωνυμίας.** The origin and meaning of the names is obscure. The current Greek view given by Hdt., that

ἐπωνυμίας ἐπιχωρίων, πάρεξ Αἴαντος· τοῦτον δὲ ἅτε ἀστυγείτονα καὶ σύμμαχον, ξεῖνον ἐόντα, προσέθετο.

Ταῦτα δέ, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐμιμέετο ὁ Κλεισθένης οὗτος τὸν 67
ἑωυτοῦ μητροπάτορα Κλεισθένεα τὸν Σικυῶνος τύραννον. Κλει-

---

they were the proper names of veritable persons, sons of Ion, ancestors and eponyms of the four *Phylae*, can hardly be now advocated. There being no positive evidence in favour of the existence of the persons, it is probable that the names are products of the same historic imagination as that which created an Amphictyon to be founder of the Amphictyons, and rationalised the supposed ethnic affinities of the Hellenic stocks into the national pedigree, marking the cadetship in Hellenism of Ionians and Achaians by making Ion and Achaios one step farther removed than Doros and Aiolos from Hellen. That the names were once significant can hardly be doubted; but their significance is not clear. Γελέοντες has been connected with √ΓΕΛ denoting brightness. That Γελέοντες not Τελέοντες is the correct form of the word is proved by inscriptions from Teos, Kyzikos, and Attica (*C.I.G.* 3078, 3664, 3665, and Ross, *Attisch-Demen*, S. VII. Stein), a fact of which L. & S. take no notice, *sub v.* Τελέοντες. Αἰγικορεῖς is taken to mean goatherds (*vide* L. & S. *sub v.*). But who will venture to guarantee that etymology in view of the *aigis* and its possibilities, cp. 4. 189 *supra*, and Αἰγιαλέες c. 68 *infra*. Ἀργαδεῖς (ἄργον = ἔργον, so Stein, but this seems violent. Ἐργάδεις is found in Plutarch, *Solon* 23, probably from a conjecture of the copyist to give the sense of *Husbandmen*, L. & S.) might as well be connected with √ΑΡΓ shining, as Γελέοντες with ΓΕΛ. The Ὅπλητες cannot be the heavy armed (= ὁπλίτας L. & S.) or 'warriors,' otherwise they would not hold the fourth place, least of all if the names stood in rank. That the first name should stand for 'Priests' is well-nigh impossible: there were priests in every 'tribe,' and a separate caste of priests as such could hardly have disappeared. The names are apparently co-ordinate: they may have something to say to employments, or to totems; but the origin and meaning of the names were evidently lost to the Ionians, or at least the Athenians, in Hdt.'s time. On the subject cp. K. F. Hermann's *Lehrbuch*, i.[6] § 54, pp. 294 ff.

10. **ἑτέρων.** Not Ionian, but quite different; local, indigenous heroes, of the true Attic stock, the Ionian element in Attica being foreign. The *Αἰαντὶς* took its name from Αἴας of Salamis, which since its conquest by Peisistratos had been an Athenian kleruchy, and probably the first of its kind: cp. c. 77 *infra*.

It is remarkable that there is no hint in Hdt. of the method by which the eponyms for the new *Phylae* were selected. He represents it as the immediate work of Kleisthenes (ἐξευρὼν . . προσέθετο, though the latter, it may be observed, is middle voice). The Ἀθ. πολ. c. 21 supplies the omission with much verisimilitude: ταῖς δὲ φυλαῖς ἐποίησεν ἐπωνύμους, ἐκ τῶν προκριθέντων ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγετῶν, οὓς ἀνεῖλεν ἡ Πυθία δέκα. Cp. further c. 69 *infra* and Appendix IX. § 9.

67. 1. **δοκέειν ἐμοί.** Hdt. makes himself responsible for the curious view of Kleisthenes' policy. The mimetic aspect is decidedly far fetched: the contrast between the two policies is more obvious than the resemblance. Hdt.'s reflections on politics are sometimes defective; cp. Introduction, § 22.

2. **μητροπάτωρ.** The exact connexion is not cleared up till 6. 126 ff. in the story of the wedding of Agariste. That the Athenian 'Liberator' should be grandson and namesake of a Despot throws some light on the alleged 'misotyrannism' of the Alkmaionidae. Cp. 6. 121 ff.

Σικυών, one of the great Dorian states of the Peloponnesos 8. 43 (cp. Pausanias, 2. 6, 7, 7. 1), was not a member of the Achaian Dodekapolis 1. 145, though the time came (251 B.C.) when it "stooped to ask for admission to the franchise of the remnant of the conquered Achaians" (Freeman, *History of Federal Government*, 2nd ed. p. 285). The τυραννὶς in Sikyon no doubt marks, as everywhere in the Peloponnesos, at least in the vii.-vi. centuries B.C., a reaction and revival of the native or prae-Dorian population and interests against the Dorian conquerors (cp. c. 92 *infra*). In the case of Sikyon this movement is complicated by a rivalry

σθένης γὰρ Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψῳδοὺς ἔπαυσε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὁμηρείων ἐπέων εἵνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέαται· τοῦτο δέ, ἡρώιον γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγορῇ τῶν Σικυωνίων Ἀδρήστου τοῦ Ταλαοῦ, τοῦτον ἐπεθύμησε ὁ Κλεισθένης ἐόντα Ἀργεῖον ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ τῆς χώρης. ἐλθὼν δὲ ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐχρηστηριάζετο εἰ ἐκβάλοι τὸν Ἄδρηστον· ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ φᾶσα Ἄδρηστον μὲν εἶναι Σικυωνίων βασιλέα, κεῖνον δὲ λευστῆρα. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς τοῦτό

---

with Argos. It shows how completely the Homeric poems had been appropriated by the Dorian conquerors that the Achaian representative of the anti- and prae-Dorian interests in opposition to Dorian Argos surrenders the works, which celebrated the Achaian heroes, to the men who had usurped their places and exploited their traditions. But as Blakesley points out, the objection of Kleisthenes would hardly apply to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and so we must understand by Ὁμήρεια ἔπη the *Thebais* and *Epigoni* (with Stein) or the *Thebais-Epigoni* (cp. Bethe, *Theban. Heldenl.* p. 38), a view which is borne out by the reference to Adrastos below, who is barely mentioned in the two former, while he must have been the chief hero of the latter poem, or poems. Yet Hdt., who had doubts as to the 'Homeric' authorship of the *Kypria* (2. 117), would hardly have ascribed the *Thebais* or *Epigoni* to Homer.

3. **Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας.** The date of this war cannot be fixed: it is curious to find the tyrant of Sikyon doing the work of Sparta: Sparta may have been still eclipsed by 'Dorian' Argos. The rise of Sparta to Hegemony is later, 1. 65.

ἔπαυσε . . ἀγωνίζεσθαι. The more usual construction would be *ἀγωνιζομένους*, which, however, might give rise to the false idea that the Rhapsodists were stopped in the very act (St.).

6. **ἔστι** does not prove that Hdt. had been to Sikyon: it only anticipates the defeat of Kleisthenes in his attempt to exterminate Adrastos. Cp. Introduction, § 16, v, and p. lxxxi.

Ἀδρήστου. Adrastos son of Talaos the Argive, to be distinguished from Adrastos son of Gordias, the Phrygian, 1. 35 ff., Bethe in Pauly *R.-E.*[3] But cp. Posnansky, *Nemesis und Adrasteia*, p. 87. *ὅτε Ἄδραστος ἔφευγεν ἐξ Ἄργους παρὰ Πόλυβον ἦλθεν ἐς Σικυῶνα καὶ ὕστερον ἀποθανόντος Πολύβου τὴν ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀρχὴν ἔσχεν*, Pausan. 2. 6, 6. He is subsequently restored to Argos.

7. **τοῦτον . . ἐκβαλεῖν.** Coupled with the Hero-worship is the animistic belief, that to retain or expel the corpse is to retain or expel the man. Cp. the story of the bones of Orestes, 1. 68, the bringing of the bones of Theseus to Athens, Plut. *Theseus*, 36 etc. But A-drastos would be the last person in the world to run away! (Cp. 4. 142.) How Adrastos came to be buried at Sikyon is not made clear: he was reported to have died at Megara, on the way back from Thebes (Pausan. 1. 43, 1). Some held that the tomb in Sikyon was a cenotaph (Schol. to Pindar, *Nem.* 9. 30). As Hero he was specially connected with Adrasteia-Nemesis, and was the Avenger ("der unentrinnbare Rächer" *ἀ-διδράσκω*); see Schöll, *apud* Pauly, i.[2] pp. 187 ff., Roscher (*totidem verbis*), 78 ff., Posnansky, *op. cit.* pp. 82 ff. A tyrant might well object to Adrastos!

8. **Δελφούς.** If this *θεωρία* took place during or after the First 'Sacred War,' in which Kleisthenes had espoused the cause of Delphi (Pausan. 2. 9, 6, 10. 37, 6), the reply to a benefactor is the more astonishing. It is probably unhistorical.

10. **Σικυωνίων βασιλέα.** Cp. *Il.* 2. 572 *καὶ Σικυῶν' ὅθ' ἄρ' Ἄδρηστος πρῶτ' ἐμβασίλευεν*. Delphi had no real hostility to 'tyrants' as such: witness the relations with Kypselos of Corinth 1. 14, Miltiades, son of Kypselos of Athens, 6. 34. ff., the Battiadae 4. 155, 162, 163, Gelon of Syracuse 7. 163, not to speak of foreign potentates, Gyges, Amasis, *etc.* Kleisthenes was a special benefactor, cp. Bury, *l.c.* 6. 127 *infra*.

λευστῆρα. See L. & S. *sub v.* There was a jingle on *βασιλεὺς* and *λευστὴρ* in the Response, which perhaps ran *ἦν ὁ μὲν Ἄδρηστος βασιλεὺς λευστὴρ δὲ σύ γ' ἔσσι.*

γε οὐ παρεδίδου, ἀπελθὼν ὀπίσω ἐφρόντιζε μηχανὴν τῇ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἄδρηστος ἀπαλλάξεται. ὡς δέ οἱ ἐξευρῆσθαι ἐδόκεε, πέμψας ἐς Θήβας τὰς Βοιωτίας ἔφη θέλειν ἐπαγαγέσθαι Μελάνιππον τὸν Ἀστακοῦ· οἱ δὲ Θηβαῖοι ἔδοσαν. ἐπαγαγόμενος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὸν Μελάνιππον τέμενός οἱ ἀπέδεξε ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πρυτανηίῳ καί μιν ἵδρυσε ἐνθαῦτα ἐν τῷ ἰσχυροτάτῳ. ἐπηγάγετο δὲ τὸν Μελάνιππον ὁ Κλεισθένης (καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο δεῖ ἀπηγήσασθαι) ὡς ἔχθιστον ἐόντα Ἀδρήστῳ, ὃς τόν τε ἀδελφεόν οἱ Μηκιστέα ἀπεκτόνεε καὶ τὸν γαμβρὸν Τυδέα. ἐπείτε δέ οἱ τὸ τέμενος ἀπέδεξε, θυσίας τε καὶ ὁρτὰς Ἀδρήστου ἀπελόμενος ἔδωκε τῷ Μελανίππῳ. οἱ δὲ Σικυώνιοι ἐώθεσαν μεγαλωστὶ κάρτα τιμᾶν τὸν Ἄδρηστον· ἡ γὰρ χώρη ἦν αὕτη Πολύβου, ὁ δὲ Ἄδρηστος ἦν Πολύβου θυγατριδέος, ἄπαις δὲ Πόλυβος τελευτῶν διδοῖ Ἀδρήστῳ τὴν ἀρχήν. τά τε δὴ ἄλλα οἱ Σικυώνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν Ἄδρηστον καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμῶντες, τὸν δὲ Ἄδρηστον.

ὁ θεός. *Prima facie*, Apollo: but it might stand for Zeus; cp. 6. 27 *infra*.

14. **ἔδοσαν.** Melanippos, son of Astakos, according to Aischylos (*Septem*, 408) κάρτα ἐγχώριος. According to Pausanias 9. 18, 1 his tomb was outside the Proitid Gate of Thebes on the road to Chalkis. Cp. Fabricius, *Theben*, p. 22, Bethe, *Theban. Heldenl.* p. 61. The Thebans in fact support Sikyon against Argos as on a later occasion Aigina against Athens, c. 74 ff. *infra*. It is reasonable to suspect in this innocent narrative the record of political aims and combinations worthy of the ally of Solon, the father-in-law of Megakles, the founder of the Pythian Games. (Cp. Bury, *Nemean Odes*, Appendix D.)

15. **ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πρυτανηίῳ.** While Adrastos was out in the Agora (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγορῇ, l. 6 *supra*).

17. **καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο δεῖ ἀπηγήσασθαι.** Every body could not be expected to know these historical minutiae. Hdt. doubtless got them from his poetical authorities.

18. **ὅς**, *sc.* Melanippos. **οἱ**, Adrastos. The killing was no murder, being done in fair fight in front of Thebes: still, it left a blood feud apparently with the Inevitable One.

23. **ἄπαις.** Without male issue. Cp. c. 48 *supra*, for Polybos also gave him his daughter, according to one tradition, and in any case was μητροπάτωρ to him.

25. **πρός**, adverb. καὶ δὴ καὶ is usual, but the previous δὴ and the πρὸς make the insertion of καὶ unadvisable.

τὰ πάθεα. Schöll (*ll.c.*) following Welcker sees in Adrastos a primitive Nature-god, of 'Chthonian' significance, with a resemblance to Dionysos: a view supported partly by appeal to the mysterious record of his πάθη, partly by some problematic etymologies: ἁδρός, ἁδρός, son of Talaos (θάλλω) = the ripe fruit, cp. 1. 17.

χοροῖσι. Presumably dithyrambic, without getting so far as dramatic impersonation, though probably with a mimetic element: cp. Bergk, *Gr. L.-G.* ii. pp. 252 ff. and Flach, *Gr. Lyrik*, p. 309.

The transfer of the tragic chorus to Dionysos was perhaps a 'popular' act, as the expulsion of Adrastos was 'anti-Argive' and the tribal readjustment 'anti-Dorian.' The three mark three moments in a rational policy, further exhibited in the alliances with Athens and Thessaly, the service to Delphi, the wedding of Agariste. It may have been at this period that the myth was developed that 'Sikyon,' the eponymous hero of the place, was an Athenian, though Pausanias reports it in Hesiod 1. 6, 3. The alternative view, supported by Ibykos, that Sikyon was the son of Pelops tells its own moral.

Κλεισθένης δὲ χοροὺς μὲν τῷ Διονύσῳ ἀπέδωκε, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην
68 θυσίην Μελανίππῳ. ταῦτα μὲν ἐς Ἄδρηστόν οἱ ἐπεποίητο,
φυλὰς δὲ τὰς Δωριέων, ἵνα δὴ μὴ αἱ αὐταὶ ἔωσι τοῖσι Σικυω-
νίοισι καὶ τοῖσι Ἀργείοισι, μετέβαλε ἐς ἄλλα οὐνόματα. ἔνθα
καὶ πλεῖστον κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυωνίων· ἐπὶ γὰρ ὑός τε καὶ
ὄνου τὰς ἐπωνυμίας μετατιθεὶς αὐτὰ τὰ τελευταῖα ἐπέθηκε, πλὴν
τῆς ἑωυτοῦ φυλῆς· ταύτῃ δὲ τὸ οὔνομα ἀπὸ τῆς ἑωυτοῦ ἀρχῆς
ἔθετο. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ Ἀρχέλαοι ἐκαλέοντο, ἕτεροι δὲ Ὑᾶται,

---

27. **ἀπέδωκε.** Something turns upon the meaning of this word, or perhaps the meaning of the word must be determined by historical arguments. Does it mean 'restored,' 'gave back,' or does it mean simply: 'duly assigned,' 'rightly gave up'? From the instances (cp. L. & S. p. 179), it is obvious that it may here mean either. Does Hdt. imply that the choruses had been taken from Dionysos? If so, by whom? Bergk (*op. c.* 254) is prepared with the answer, arguing that political motives had led to the transfer of the honours to Adrastos, and that Kleisthenes "restored the tragic choruses to their original object." The first robbery is put down conjecturally to the Sikyonian poet Epigenes (cp. Bergk, *l.c.*). This view is endorsed by Mahaffy, *Gk. Lit.* i.[2] c. xiv. *ad init.* But the conjecture seems elaborate and superfluous, if Adrastos was originally a 'Chthonian' divinity. Even if Hdt., or his source, had intended by ἀπέδωκε a 'restoration,' the fact would not be indisputable, for it would have been natural enough to represent such an innovation as a restoration: but the text of Hdt. does not support the view, his statement being that the men of Sikyon used to honour not Dionysos, but Adrastos, until Kleisthenes, so to speak, divided the divine from the heroic elements in the cult of Adrastos, assigning the divine to Dionysos and the heroic to Melanippos, the one a Theban hero, and the other a god, of special association with Thebes indeed, but as a god not tied and bound to a sepulchre.

ἄλλην. Cp. 4. 191, c. 32 *supra*.

68. 3. **οὐνόματα.** A mere change of name would not have broken down the Dorian phylic system in Sikyon, nor could the members of the Dorian Phylae have been persuaded to adopt and maintain sixty years after the death of Kleisthenes—down to the date of the expulsion of the Peisistratidae from Athens—mere nicknames or terms of contempt. Is it even certain that the 'Pig' and the 'Ass' were contemptible animals in the eyes of Adrasteians or of Dionysiacs? In the form of a wild Boar, μέγα χρῆμα ὑός, the Pig might play a providential rôle in an Adrastos-Myth (cp. 1. 34 ff.), and though not perhaps in 'purely Hellenic' religion, yet in the religion of Hellenes, the Pig was an holy animal (cp. Ramsay, *Asia Minor*, pp. 31 f.). The Ass, indeed, was in little reverence among the Greeks (cp. *Paroemiographi*, ed. Gaisford, or Leutsch and Schneidewin, Index, *sub v.*), yet his name appears honourably associated with the landscape of Hellas in ὄνου γνάθος, ὄνου ῥάχις, τὸ Ὄνειον (a hill near Corinth) (cp. Grasberger, *Studien*, p. 99), albeit this nomenclature may have been a bequest from a people, other than Hellenes, that had the Ass in more honour. If the Archelai become the localised Aigilees, who certainly represent a prae-Dorian population, the 'nicknames' might possibly represent localities, and localisations of the Dorian *phylae*. Cp. Ὑάμπολις, Σύεσσα, Ὑάμπεια, Σύαγρος, Σύβοτα, αἱ Χοιράδες *et al.* (Grasberger, *op. c.* p. 101). 'Pigs,' 'Asses,' 'Swine' are possible totems, for which however parallels can hardly be found. Perhaps names and nicknames existed side by side, and were not used by the same classes or persons at Sikyon. The 60 years may mark the duration of the anti-Dorian régime at Sikyon, and the supposed recovery of the old tribal names may signify in reality the restoration of the Dorian and aristocratic régime. (Stein quotes Plutarch, *Mor.* 859 = *de Herodoti malig.* c. 22, where the expulsion of a tyrant Aischines from Sikyon by the Spartans is mentioned, but not dated.)

ἄλλοι δὲ Ὀνεᾶται, ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεᾶται. τούτοισι τοῖσι οὐνόμασι τῶν φυλέων ἐχρέωντο οἱ Σικυώνιοι καὶ ἐπὶ Κλεισθένεος ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐκείνου τεθνεῶτος ἔτι ἐπ' ἔτεα ἑξήκοντα· μετέπειτα μέντοι λόγον σφίσι δόντες μετέβαλον ἐς τοὺς Ὑλλέας καὶ Παμφύλους καὶ Δυμανάτας, τετάρτους δὲ αὐτοῖσι προσέθεντο ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀδρήστου παιδὸς Αἰγιαλέος τὴν ἐπωνυμίην ποιεύμενοι κεκλῆσθαι Αἰγιαλέας.

69 Ταῦτα μέν νυν ὁ Σικυώνιος Κλεισθένης ἐπεποιήκεε· ὁ δὲ δὴ Ἀθηναῖος Κλεισθένης ἐὼν τοῦ Σικυωνίου τούτου θυγατριδέος καὶ τὸ οὔνομα ἐπὶ τούτου ἔχων, δοκέειν ἐμοὶ καὶ οὗτος ὑπεριδὼν Ἴωνας, ἵνα μή σφισι αἱ αὐταὶ ἔωσι φυλαὶ καὶ Ἴωσι, τὸν ὁμώνυμον Κλεισθένεα ἐμιμήσατο. ὡς γὰρ δὴ τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον πρότερον ἀπωσμένον τότε πάντων πρὸς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ μοῖραν προσεθήκατο,

---

11. **μετέβαλον.** We might have expected *πάλιν* or some word to indicate that the change was a restoration, if a restoration it really was. Hylleis, Pamphyli, Dymanes were the three 'tribes' of Dorians: though the first, as descendants of 'Herakles,' and the second, on plain etymological grounds, look little like pure Dorian kinships. Steph. Byz. *sub v.* Δυμᾶν is much to the point: *φῦλον Δωριέων. ἦσαν δὲ τρεῖς Ὑλλεῖς καὶ Πάμφυλοι καὶ Δυμᾶνες ἐξ Ἡρακλέους. καὶ προσετέθη ἡ Ὑρνιθία ὡς Ἔφορος α'. Αἰγίμιος γὰρ ἦν τῶν περὶ τὴν Οἴτην Δωριέων βασιλεύς. ἔσχε δὲ δύο παῖδας, Πάμφυλον καὶ Δυμᾶνα, καὶ τὸν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους Ὕλλον ἐποιήσατο τρίτον, χάριν ἀποδιδοὺς ἀνθ' ὧν Ἡρακλῆς ἐκπεπτωκότα κατήγαγεν. οἱ οἰκοῦντες Δυμᾶνες* (*sic*)· *καὶ Δυμανὶς τὸ θηλυκὸν καὶ Δύμαινα.* Cp. K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch*, i.[6] § 16, for literature and reff.

12. **ἐπὶ τοῦ**, cc. 65 *supra*, 69 *infra*.

14. **Αἰγιαλέες** was undoubtedly a name for the non-Dorian population 'along shore.' Cp. 7. 94. On the hypothetical eponymous ancestor cp. c. 66 *supra*. The non-Dorian, prae-Dorian character of Adrastos comes out plainly: whether he was an 'Ionian,' Achaian, Pelasgian, Asiatic, or what not, is hard to say. According to one tradition Sikyon was originally called Aigialeia and the name Sikyon marked the Attic (Ionian) advent: Pausan. 1. 6, 2.

69. 3. **δοκέειν ἐμοί.** Cp. c. 67 *supra*. Hdt. makes himself explicitly responsible for this theory or reflection: was it not one he borrowed or found ready made in Athens? But the motive here ascribed to Kleisthenes is superficial, and misses the full and the true significance of the change described. The imitative element (*ἐμιμήσατο*) in the change is not conspicuous: an anti-Ionian reform, as such, is not an imitation of an anti-Dorian reform: and the Athenians did not secede from the Ionian organisation, or cease to celebrate the great Ionian festival (1. 147), much less invent nicknames for the old tribes. Nay more, it is probable that many Ionians in Athens were enfranchised by Kleisthenes, among his metic citizens, Arist. *Pol.* 3. 2, 3 (1275^b). In so far, however, as the reform of Kleisthenes was a democratic move, and broke with the ancient régime, based on blood and genetic associations, it offered some analogy to the policy of his grandfather at Sikyon. An anti-Ionian character might, indeed, to some extent seem to belong to it, inasmuch as the breach with the foreign policy and relations of the Peisistratidae, and the preoccupation with domestic questions, might bring about a temporary chill or estrangement with Delos, Naxos, Miletos, Euboea. Yet within ten years, if Hdt. may be trusted, an Ionian alliance was formed at Athens, expressly on the ground of the consanguinity and metropolitan connexion, c. 97 *infra*.

6. **πάντων** where it stands makes no sense. To insert *μεταδιδούς*, as Stein suggests, is to charge Hdt. with a great exaggeration; to read *ἀπωσμένον πάντων, τότε πρὸς κτλ.* involves a possible exaggeration. The best sense would be made by reading *τότε πάντα* . . Kleis-

τὰς φυλὰς μετωνόμασε καὶ ἐποίησε πλεῦνας ἐξ ἐλασσόνων· δέκα τε δὴ φυλάρχους ἀντὶ τεσσέρων ἐποίησε, δέκα δὲ καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατένειμε ἐς τὰς φυλάς· ἦν τε τὸν δῆμον προσθέμενος πολλῷ κατύ-

thenes gained the whole demos over, and joined it to his ranks—cp. c. 66 *supra*.

7. **τὰς φυλὰς μετωνόμασε.** Misled by his false parallel Hdt. mistakes the nature of the reform. The four Phylae must have remained, or at least the φρατρίαι which were their sub-divisions, and which appear in post-Kleisthenic Athens, in use even for civil purposes. Cp. Ἀθην. πολ. 21. 6 τὰ δὲ γένη καὶ τὰς φρατρίας καὶ τὰς ἱερωσύνας εἴασεν ἔχειν ἑκάστους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, with Sandys' note. But cp. Appendix IX. § 10.

δέκα τε δὴ κτλ. The notion that in the Kleisthenic *phylae* there were at any time one hundred Demi neither more nor less must now be regarded as utterly untenable in view of the evidence of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, which (1) lends no support to it, (2) presents an alternative, c. 21. The question remains whether Hdt. in this passage justifies that notion, and shared that error. In commenting on this passage, before the discovery of the Ἀθ. π. and at a time when the arguments of Schömann and others in favour of the 100 Demes, ten to each Phyle, appeared to have been raised almost to demonstration by the reading of the Berlin Fragment (H. Diels, *Ueber die Berliner Fragmente*, etc. Berlin, 1885, p. 24) I ventured to suggest that either the text was corrupt, or Hdt.'s own view on the matter was confused, for no one wishing to say that Kleisthenes distributed the (100) demes, ten to each of the Phylae, would have expressed himself as in the text: nor could the text as it stood be translated naturally, except to mean that there were ten Demi distributed into the Phylae, which of course was nonsense, as δέκα φυλάρχους implied that the number of the Phylae was ten. Madvig had solved the difficulty by deleting δέκα δέ, a proceeding at once drastic and insufficient. Can the text thus produced: δέκα τε δὴ φυλάρχους ἀντὶ τεσσέρων ἐποίησε καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατένειμε ἐς τὰς φυλὰς be regarded as satisfactory? It leaves the number of the Phylae a matter of inference, and it puts the cart before the horse, the 'Phylarchs' before the 'Phylae': while it leaves the *corruptela* as great a difficulty as ever. Hdt. perhaps wrote as follows: τὰς φυλὰς μετωνόμασε καὶ ἐποίησε πλεῦνας ἐξ ἐλασσόνων· δέκα μὲν γὰρ φυλὰς ἀντὶ τεσσέρων ἐποίησε δέκα τε δὴ φυλάρχους· τοὺς δὲ δήμους κατένειμε ἐς τὰς (δέκα) φυλάς.

8. **φυλάρχους.** We might have expected στρατηγούς, whose existence, number, and title are implied in the narrative of the Marathonian campaign (6. 109) and whose institution has in general been inferentially assigned to Kleisthenes. Nor can the Ἀθην. πολ. c. 22 be taken to assert that the ten strategi were only *instituted* in 501 B.C., nor, if it could, would the case of the 'Phylarchs' in Hdt. be any clearer. After τεσσέρων must be supplied grammatically φυλάρχων, but technically φυλοβασιλέων (cp. Ἀθ. π. 8. 41, 57), and if φύλαρχος can thus stand generically for φυλοβασιλεὺς why not for στρατηγός? But the chief material difficulty arises from the fact that at the time when Hdt. was writing there were not merely ten strategi, but there were also ten *Phylarchs*, properly so called, the commanders of the cavalry, as were the taxiarchs of the Hoplites, cp. Ἀθ. π. c. 61. The same treatise c. 30 carries the Phylarchs back beyond the last decade of the fifth century (411 B.C.); and they may be safely carried farther back to the period of the creation, or development and reorganisation of the cavalry, which amounted at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war probably to 1000 (100 from each Phyle?), Aristoph. *Eq.* 225, Xenoph. *Hipparch.* 9. 3, or 1200 ξὺν ἱπποτοξόταις, Thuc. 2. 13. In the time of Kleisthenes they may not have amounted to above 100; they have no record in the battle of Marathon (cp. 6. 112). At the battle of Plataea there may have been 300 (cp. 9. 21, 22). Andokides, indeed, appears to give a date for these 300, *de Pace* § 5—but it is almost impossible to base any inference on the passage (see Jebb, *Attic Orators*, i.[2] p. 130) even if it be genuine. In any case Hdt. writing at a date when the Phylarchs are prominent officers in Athens, leaves this passage uncorrected: the inference is inevitable that he was not sufficiently careful or well informed in regard to Athenian institutions.

περθε τῶν ἀντιστασιωτέων. ἐν τῷ μέρεϊ δὲ ἑσσούμενος ὁ Ἰσαγόρης 70
ἀντιτεχνᾶται τάδε· ἐπικαλέεται Κλεομένεα τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον γενόμενον ἑωυτῷ ξεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς Πεισιστρατιδέων πολιορκίης· τὸν δὲ Κλεομένεα εἶχε αἰτίη φοιτᾶν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰσαγόρεω τὴν γυναῖκα. τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα πέμπων ὁ Κλεομένης ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας κήρυκα ἐξέβαλλε Κλεισθένεα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλους πολλοὺς Ἀθηναίων, τοὺς ἐναγέας ἐπιλέγων· ταῦτα δὲ πέμπων ἔλεγε ἐκ διδαχῆς τοῦ Ἰσαγόρεω. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι καὶ οἱ συστασιῶται αὐτῶν εἶχον αἰτίην τοῦ φόνου τούτου, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ μετεῖχε οὐδ' οἱ φίλοι αὐτοῦ. οἱ δ' ἐναγέες Ἀθηναίων ὧδε ὠνομάσθησαν. ἦν Κύλων 71

---

70. 1. **ἑσσούμενος.** If the Kleisthenean constitution was really completed before the second advent of Kleomenes, the defeat of Isagoras may have reflected itself in the elections to the executive. Unfortunately the list of Archons gives no names between Isagoras in 508 B.C. and an unknown Akestorides in 504 B.C., Clinton, *F. H.* ii.[3] p. 20. (The Ἀθ. π. does not supply the void, but dates the legislation of Kleisthenes to the Archontate of Isagoras, c. 21.)

2. **Κλεομένεα . . ξεῖνον.** Cp. c. 63 *supra*, on the ξεινίη with the Peisistratidae, a comparison which may suggest in part the origin of the statement that Isagoras was a friend of the Peisistratidae: added to the fact that he was undoubtedly an enemy to Kleisthenes.

4. **εἶχε αἰτίη.** Likely enough Alkmaionid scandal. If Gorgo was eight or nine years old at the time of Aristagoras' visit to Sparta c. 51 *supra*, her birth would fall about the time of her father's expeditions into Attica. Contr. form of expression εἶχον αἰτίην *infra*.

5. **ἐξέβαλλε.** N.B. imperfect: he did not succeed. Cp. c. 22 *supra*. Whether Kleomenes could have undertaken this action ἄνευ τοῦ κοινοῦ (cp. 6. 50), may be doubted. See Appendix VII. § 8.

8. **οἱ μὲν κτλ.** A clumsy sentence, τοῦ φόνου τούτου being unintelligible before c. 71. This obscurity of language betrays the historian's embarrassment.

9. **αὐτός.** Referring apparently to Isagoras.

71. 1. **ὧδε.** The story of the origin of the ἄγος is told by Thucydides 1. 126 at greater length and varying in some important particulars from the version of Hdt., and Plutarch, *Solon* 12, takes sides with Thucydides. The Thucydidean version is more complete, intelligible, and authoritative than the story as here told, and is certainly a designed correction if not of the text of Hdt. at least of the (Alkmaionid) tradition upon which the text of Hdt. is based. This will appear from the comments following. It may now be added that the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία lends no support to the Herodotean version. True, the new text just misses recording the story of Kylon, but (1) Plutarch (*l. c.*) may be taken as evidence for the version in the Ἀθ. π. (2) The Ἀθ. π. knows nothing of Prytaneis of the Naukrari or Naukrariae at any stage. (3) The Ἀθ. π. in putting the Naukrari in line with the Demarchs of later date (c. 21, a passage already known from Harpokration, *s. v.* ναυκραρικά), condemns the Herodotean version: for if the Naukrari corresponded to the Demarchs they could never have been on a level with the 'Archons' (though their 'principals,' superior officers, might have been). It is important in this connexion to remember the respective *interests* of the Sources. Herodotus and Thucydides tell the story of Kylon *apropos* of the ἐναγεῖς, the Alkmaionids: Plutarch's interest in the story arises from Solon's connexion with it, as the trial and expiation took place thanks to Solon: the author of the Ἀθ. π. was specially concerned with its bearing on the constitutional history: no one tells the story merely on its own merits, or in the interests of Kylon.

Κύλων. Thuc. adds that he was of ancient lineage and political importance, and had to wife a daughter of Theagenes tyrant of Megara.

τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀνὴρ Ὀλυμπιονίκης· οὗτος ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἐκόμησε, προσποιησάμενος δὲ ἑταιρηίην τῶν ἡλικιωτέων καταλαβεῖν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐπειρήθη, οὐ δυνάμενος δὲ ἐπικρατῆσαι ἱκέτης ἵζετο πρὸς τὸ ἄγαλμα. τούτους ἀνιστᾶσι μὲν οἱ πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων, οἵ περ ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὑπεγγύους πλὴν θανάτου· φονεῦσαι

---

2. **Ὀλυμπιονίκης.** The full bearing of this fact on the story is not brought out in the Herodotean version. *Vide infra.*

ἐκόμησε. *ἐπὶ τῷ κομᾷς*; Aristoph. *Wasps*, 1317 (cp. L. & S. *sub v.* *κομάω*). Thuc. states that Kylon consulted the Delphic oracle and was directed to seize the akropolis *ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς μεγίστῃ ἑορτῇ.* Instead of inquiring further whether this phrase referred to the Peloponnesian Olympia, or to the Athenian Diasia, as an Olympic victor he assumed the former interpretation and timed his *coup* accordingly.

3. **προσποιησάμενος.** Thuc. says that beside gaining over his *φίλοι* he received assistance from Theagenes. For the verb cp. 6. 66 *infra*, for *ἑταιρηίη* cp. c. 66 *supra*.

4. **ἐπειρήθη.** According to Thuc. Kylon *κατέλαβε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.*

οὐ δυνάμενος κτλ. According to Thuc. the Athenians *en masse* (*πανδημεί*) besieged Kylon and his friends and supporters in the Akropolis. The siege lasted some time, till the majority went home, after leaving a force on guard, and empowering the *Archons* to act in the matter with full authority. This vote of the *ἐκκλησία* is a trifle suspicious and in the later manner.

ἱκέτης. Hdt. says that Kylon took refuge as a suppliant at the statue [of Athene Polias]. Thuc. says that Kylon and his brother made good their escape by flight (*ἐκδιδράσκουσι*): their followers took station as suppliants at the altar, after some of them had died of hunger.

5. **οἱ πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων, οἵ περ ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας.** Thuc. says: *τότε δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἔπρασσον.* Thuc. is here certainly right *prima facie* against Hdt. Even if the Naukrariae and Naukrari were prae-Solonian institutions the 'Prytaneis of the Naukraries' cannot have been superior officers to the Archontes. The 'Prytaneis of the Naukrari' may have been, as Rawlinson suggests, 'the chief military officers' subordinate of course to the Archontes (or rather, to the Polemarch ?), a suggestion to be preferred to his alternative that they were a council or court which assisted the chief (*sic*) Archons in the decision of criminal causes. Another hypothesis is open. By *πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων* may have been meant the Archons. Harpokration, indeed, points to such a solution (*sub v.* *Ναυκραρικά*): *ναυκράρους γὰρ τὸ παλαιὸν τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἔλεγον, ὡς ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ Ἡρόδοτος δηλοῖ.* But to this article there are three objections: (1) it looks like an *inference* to harmonise Hdt. and Thucydides; (2) the Ἀθ. πολ. identifies the *ναύκραροι* with the *δήμαρχοι*: (3) if Hdt. proves anything it is not that the *ναύκραροι*, but that the *πρυτάνιες τ. ν.* = *οἱ ἄρχοντες.* (Reading *ναυκραριέων*, indeed, *οἱ πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκραριέων* might be = *οἱ ναύκραροι.*) It would, however, hardly be safe to argue that the Athenian Archons had ever been known officially as *ναύκραροι* or *πρυτάνιες τῶν ν.* Rather in the light of the articulate account of the origin of the archontic offices and titles given by the Ἀθ. πολ. we may conclude that this passage in Hdt. is erroneous and misleading. The motive and tendency are not far to seek. The rôle assigned to the Prytaneis of the Naukrari in the narrative looks very like an attempt to absolve the (Alkmaionid) Archontes, who Thuc. distinctly says were responsible for what took place (1) in virtue of the magisterial authority of the Archons at that date, (2) in virtue of a special commission *ad hoc.* If in this matter Thucydides had any bias, it would presumably be due to his connexion with the Philaidae.

6. **ὑπεγγύους π. θ.** Thuc. has *ἐφ' ᾧ μηδὲν κακὸν ποιήσουσιν.*

φονεῦσαι. Thuc. says that they were taken away and put to death, the breach of faith being aggravated by the circumstance that some of the prisoners managed on the way to take refuge at the sanctuary of the *Σεμναί* and were put to death there and then.

δὲ αὐτοὺς αἰτίη ἔχει Ἀλκμεωνίδας. ταῦτα πρὸ τῆς Πεισιστράτου ἡλικίης ἐγένετο.

Κλεομένης δὲ ὡς πέμπων ἐξέβαλλε Κλεισθένεα καὶ τοὺς 72
ἐναγέας, Κλεισθένης μὲν αὐτὸς ὑπεξέσχε, μετὰ δὲ οὐδὲν ἧσσον παρῆν ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ὁ Κλεομένης οὐ σὺν μεγάλῃ χειρί, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἀγηλατέει ἑπτακόσια ἐπίστια Ἀθηναίων, τά οἱ ὑπέθετο ὁ Ἰσαγόρης. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσας δεύτερα τὴν βουλὴν καταλύειν

---

7. **αἰτίη.** We must suppose that the Head of the House and perhaps other members were in office at the time. This view although not expressly stated by Hdt. or Thuc. is found in Plutarch, *Solon* 12 *Μεγακλῆς καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες.*

πρὸ τῆς Πεισιστράτου ἡλικίης. A very vague chronological datum. For Hdt. indeed the continuous history of Athens practically begins with Peisistratos. The Solonian reforms are barely referred to: the Drakonian legislation is not mentioned; much less the *coup d'état* of Damasippos (Arist. Ἀθ. πολ. *Berlin Frag.* ed. Diels, p. 10 = Ἀθηναίων π. c. 13). It is possible that he thought of Kylon's attempt as shortly preceding the more successful stroke of Peisistratos. The date in the Ἀθ. π. is indefinite, simply placing Kylon before Solon, or perhaps Drakon, though the passage on Drakon (c. 4) is in the highest degree suspicious. Thuc. gives two chronological points in the story: the synchronism with Theagenes in Megara, and the Olympiad. But these are insufficient by themselves. The list of Archontes also fails us. Clinton, *F. H.* vol. i. dates the attempt of Kylon 620 B.C. one year after the Legislation of Drakon, twenty years after the Olympian victory of Kylon himself, and twenty-four years before the purification of Epimenides and the first expulsion of the ἄγος. It is possible that the *coup d'état* and the Legislation of Drakon stood in some causal relation to each other: but if so, it is perhaps more likely that the attempt of Kylon preceded the Legislation of Drakon. So Busolt, *Gr. Geschichte*, i.[1] 540 ff. The discovery of the text of the Ἀθ. πολ. has of course confirmed Busolt's suggestion, which has also been endorsed by J. H. Wright, *The Date of Cylon*, Boston, 1892. This digression on the ἄγος (cp. 6. 91) may possibly have been inserted after the *pourparlers*, recorded by Thuc. (1. 126), had revived the discussion. This hypothesis might explain the stylistic inequalities.

72. 1. **ἐξέβαλλε**, c. 70 *supra*.

2. **αὐτός.** This voluntary exile of Kleisthenes was afterwards perhaps improved by tradition into an Ostrakism, the engineer being thus "hoist with his own petard." Aelian, 13. 24, cp. Diels, *op. c.* p. 30. The Ἀθηναίων π. says nothing of the acts or fate of Kleisthenes after his Legislation, dates the first use of the Law *περὶ τὸν ὀστρακισμὸν* to the year 488 B.C. though the Law itself is ascribed to Kleisthenes (*op. c.* 22), and places the retirement of Kleisthenes before his Legislation, which is effected after his return (c. 20). This arrangement gives a better 'perspective' than the text of Hdt.

4. **ἑπτακόσια.** The number is large; the expulsion is effected *οὐ σὺν μεγάλῃ χειρί.*

ἐπίστια = *ἱστίαι*, 1. 176, 6. 86.

5. **δεύτερα.** Cp. cc. 38 *supra*, 111 *infra*. Stein (note c. 70) connects with *τὰ μὲν πρῶτα* there, *i.e.* first of all Kleomenes proceeded to get rid of Kleisthenes, and indeed came to Athens to complete the work: secondly he endeavoured to overthrow the institutions of which Kleisthenes was the author. But is not this reference a little far-fetched? *δεύτερα* hardly balances grammatically *τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα*, and materially the order of events is (1) a message from Kleomenes to expel Kleisthenes and his partisans, (2) the retirement of Kleisthenes, (3) the advent of Kleomenes (*οὐδὲν ἧσσον παρῆν*), (4) the expulsion of the 700 families, (5) *ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσας* Kleomenes next (*δεύτερα*) attacked the *Bulè*. Historically, the order of events is to say the least questionable, as it is not borne out by the Ἀθ. π.

βουλή. The Kleisthenean *Bulè* of 500 members, here first mentioned (cp. Ἀθ. π. 21). That after the actual expulsion of 700 (Kleisthenean) anti-

ἐπειρᾶτο, τριηκοσίοισι δὲ τοῖσι Ἰσαγόρεω στασιώτῃσι τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐνεχείριζε. ἀντισταθείσης δὲ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ οὐ βουλομένης πείθεσθαι, ὅ τε Κλεομένης καὶ ὁ Ἰσαγόρης καὶ οἱ στασιῶται αὐτοῦ καταλαμβάνουσι τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. Ἀθηναίων δὲ οἱ λοιποὶ τὰ αὐτὰ φρονήσαντες ἐπολιόρκεον αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας δύο· τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ ὑπόσπονδοι ἐξέρχονται ἐκ τῆς χώρης ὅσοι ἦσαν αὐτῶν Λακεδαιμόνιοι. ἐπετελέετο δὲ τῷ Κλεομένεϊ ἡ φήμη. ὡς γὰρ ἀνέβη ἐς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν μέλλων δὴ αὐτὴν κατασχήσειν, ἤιε ἐς τὸ ἄδυτον

---

oligarchic households, men, women, and children, the *Bulè* of 500 should have successfully resisted an attempt at its own dissolution would speak volumes for the success of the Kleisthenean institutions, and suggest the reflection that they had been in working order some time before the intervention of Kleomenes, if only the order of events and the figures could be trusted. But if the Ἀθ. π. cc. 20 f. is right, the Constitution of Kleisthenes was subsequent to these acts of Kleomenes. The conduct of the unpaid *Bulè* on this occasion is an ideal and undesigned contrast to the conduct of the paid *Bulè* in 411 B.C. (Thuc. 8. 69, 70).

καταλύειν ἐπειρᾶτο. *καταλαβεῖν ἐπειρήθη*, c. 71.

6. **τὰς ἀρχάς,** *sc.* *τὰς βουλευτικάς.* The places of the 500 were to be taken by a council of 300. The Solonian Council had been 400, 100 from each of the four Ionian *Phylae*, Ἀθ. π. 21. According to the new text, it would be the Solonian Council which was still existing at this crisis.

10. **τὰ αὐτὰ φρονήσαντες** may cover a meeting of the Ekklesia: though, if the Ἀθ. πολ. be right in its date for the expulsion of Kleisthenes, it was the Ekklesia of Solon, not that of Kleisthenes. That the names of the popular leaders on this occasion have dropped out of the tradition is much to be regretted. Xanthippos, Aristeides probably took part in these transactions: Kallimachos, Stesagoras, Kynegeiros and others of the *Μαραθωνομάχαι* may have been of service. Miltiades was presumably in the Chersonese. Hipparchos, the Peisistratid, who would probably have been opposed to Isagoras and his doings, by an irony of fate may have worked for the restoration of the Alkmaionid. But it is dangerous to speculate where tradition is so meagre. Political jealousy (*φθόνος*) has too often immortalised the names of traitors who ruined the state, and consigned to oblivion the names of the loyal leaders, who restored or preserved it.

τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ. So also Ἀθ. π. c. 20, probably on the authority of this passage.

12. **ἡ φήμη.** A divine or portentous intimation, cp. 3. 153 (coupled with *τέρας*) and 9. 100 (with *τεκμήριον*), here with *κλεηδών*. Cp. 9. 101.

13. **τὸ ἄδυτον τῆς θεοῦ.** As though there had been but one shrine of Athene on the Akropolis at this time. There were at least two: (1) The (old) Erechtheion, occupying the site of the later temple, the remains of which are still standing; (2) A temple known as the Hekatompedon: for the site of which, see further below. The oldest cult of Athene was certainly that in the Erechtheion, and in that shrine was preserved the archaic wooden image of the goddess. It seems probable that the shrine entered by Kleomenes was the Erechtheion. It is not, however, proven that Hdt. had that temple clearly in mind in this passage. The inchoate condition of the restored Erechtheion in his day might contribute to the ambiguity of the reference in this passage. Had Hdt. defined exactly the temple here in question he might have specified some other great shrine of Athene on the Akropolis. Ten years ago that other shrine would have been identified as a matter of course with an older temple upon the site now covered by the Parthenon of Perikles, and that older temple with the Hekatompedon. But in 1885 Dr. Dörpfeld discovered the foundations of an ancient temple close to the Erechtheion (see his article *Der alte Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis* in the *Mittheilungen*, xi. (1886), pp. 337 ff. Cp. Harrison, *Myth. and Mon.* pp. 496 ff.). If this 'central' temple, between the Erechtheion and the Parthenon, was standing down to the Persian wars, it would have to be reckoned with in this

τῆς θεοῦ ὡς προσερέων· ἡ δὲ ἱρείη ἐξαναστᾶσα ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου, πρὶν ἢ τὰς θύρας αὐτὸν ἀμεῖψαι, εἶπε "ὦ ξεῖνε Λακεδαιμόνιε, πάλιν χώρεε μηδὲ ἔσιθι ἐς τὸ ἱρόν· οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν Δωριεῦσι παριέναι ἐνθαῦτα." ὁ δὲ εἶπε "ὦ γύναι, ἀλλ' οὐ Δωριεύς εἰμι ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός." ὁ μὲν δὴ τῇ κληηδόνι οὐδὲν χρεώμενος ἐπεχείρησέ τε καὶ τότε πάλιν ἐξέπιπτε μετὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Ἀθηναῖοι κατέδησαν τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ, ἐν δὲ αὐτοῖσι καὶ Τιμησίθεον τὸν Δελφόν, τοῦ ἔργα χειρῶν τε καὶ λήματος ἔχοιμ'

---

passage. Mr. Penrose has argued that this temple had been destroyed long before the Persian wars. (For the controversy with Dr. Dörpfeld, see *J. H. S.* xii. xiii. (1891-92), *Mittheilungen*, xvii. (1892).) For a discussion of Dr. Dörpfeld's further theory that the 'central' temple was rebuilt after the Persian war (and consequently standing in Hdt.'s day), see Mr. J. G. Frazer's admirable article, *J. H. S.* xiii. pp. 154 ff. The old Hekatompedon is identified by Dr. Dörpfeld with the central temple (and in this respect he is followed by Mr. Frazer). But in any case the temple here in question was most probably the Erechtheion, rightly in my opinion identified by Mr. Frazer with the temple of Athene Polias, at any rate for the period here concerned. Cp., further, Curtius, *Stadtgeschichte*, pp. 71 ff. Lolling in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, iii. 351 f. (Smaller sanctuaries of Athene need not be considered.)

14. **ἡ ἱρείη.** Probably a lady chosen from the family of the Eteobutadae, who supplied the priest of Erechtheus and the priestess of Athene Polias for the time being (Petersen, *op. cit.* 140). Cp. Frazer, *op. cit.* p. 181, Toeppfer, *Attisch. Genealog.* p. 116.

ἐξαναστᾶσα ἐκ, 'rose up and left her seat.'

15. **τὰς θύρας**, folding-doors.

16. **πάλιν**, 'back' = *ὀπίσω*.

οὐ θεμιτὸν Δωριεῦσι. Was there a special excommunication or taboo for Dorians, or was it more general, covering all non-Ionian tribes? cp. c. 81 *infra*.

18. That Kleomenes was *Ἀχαιός* because his *mother* was an Achaian, as Blakesley suggests, is an explanation both inadequate and unnecessary. Inadequate, for the Spartan kings traced their descent through their male ancestors (see 7. 204, 8. 131); unnecessary, because those male ancestors were *ex hypothesi* of non-Dorian, of Achaian, origin, exiled and restored Herakleids, of a stock alien to the Dorian spearmen who fought under their orders, cp. 6. 53. Whether this hypothesis was true or not is another question. See note *ad l. c.* The repartee of Kleomenes gains point from the fact that his half-brother's name was *Δωριεύς*, c. 41 *supra*.

19. **πάλιν** might be a repetition of the word from *πάλιν χώρεε* just above, but looks more like a lax use with *τότε* 'then again,' *i.e.* after his forbidden act.

ἐξέπιπτε, "auffallend statt *ἐξέπεσε*" (Stein). But cp. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* ii.[2] 123 f. The expulsion of Kleomenes was a glorious and immortal memory at Athens, not without a comic side. In 411 B.C. Aristophanes recalled the episode, *Lysistrata*, 271 ff., with humorous exaggeration—

οὐ γὰρ μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ' ἐμοῦ ζῶντος ἐγχανοῦνται·
ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ Κλεομένης ὃς αὐτὴν κατέσχε πρῶτος
ἀπῆλθεν ἀψάλακτος, ἀλλ'
ὅμως Λακωνικὸν πνέων
ᾤχετο θὤπλα παραδοὺς ἐμοὶ
σμικρὸν ἔχων πάνυ τριβώνιον,
πινῶν, ῥυπῶν, ἀπαράτιλτος,
ἓξ ἐτῶν ἄλουτος.
οὕτως ἐπολιόρκησ' ἐγὼ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἐκεῖνον ὠμῶς
ἐφ' ἑπτακαίδεκ' ἀσπίδας πρὸς ταῖς πύλαις καθεύδων.

20. **τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ**, *sc.* *δέσιν*, cp. 3. 119.

21. **Δελφὸν** for *ἀδελφεόν*: an emendation by Palmerius (1587-1670) the pupil of Casaubon.

ἔχοιμ' ἄν. The protasis is suppressed, *εἰ καιρὸς εἴη* or *sim.* Cp. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 52, 2. Presumably if by one of his former deeds he had seemed to Herodotus to have deserved his fate, the historian would have narrated it. Pausanias 6. 8, 6 supplies the omission. Timasitheos

ἂν μέγιστα καταλέξαι. οὗτοι μέν νυν δεδεμένοι ἐτελεύτησαν.

73 *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα Κλεισθένεα καὶ τὰ ἑπτακόσια ἐπίστια τὰ διωχθέντα ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος μεταπεμψάμενοι πέμπουσι ἀγγέλους ἐς Σάρδις, συμμαχίην βουλόμενοι ποιήσασθαι πρὸς Πέρσας· ἠπιστέατο γάρ σφισι [πρὸς] Λακεδαιμονίους τε καὶ Κλεομένεα ἐκπεπολεμῶσθαι. ἀπικομένων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐς τὰς Σάρδις καὶ λεγόντων τὰ ἐντεταλμένα, Ἀρταφρένης ὁ Ὑστάσπεος Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος ἐπειρώτα τίνες ἐόντες ἄνθρωποι καὶ κοῦ γῆς οἰκημένοι δεοίατο Περσέων σύμμαχοι γενέσθαι, πυθόμενος δὲ πρὸς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀπεκορύφου σφι τάδε· εἰ μὲν διδοῦσι βασιλέι Δαρείῳ Ἀθηναῖοι γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ συμμαχίην σφι συνετίθετο, εἰ δὲ μὴ διδοῦσι, ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευε. οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν βαλόμενοι διδόναι ἔφασαν, βουλόμενοι τὴν συμμαχίην ποιήσασθαι. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν αἰτίας μεγάλας εἶχον.*

---

had a statue (by Ageladas) at Olympia: he had won two victories at Olympia and three at Pytho as pankratiast, and was also a daring and fortunate man of war, until this last adventure in which he met his death.

22. **ἐτελεύτησαν.** Presumably after some judicial procedure. The Ἀθ. π. c. 20 represents all the men with Kleomenes as allowed to depart with him: perhaps a pragmatic Athenian version.

73. 1. **Ἀθηναῖοι** marks presumably an act of the Ekklesia. According to Ἀθ. π. c. 21 it is not until the fourth year after the 'regifuge' and *ἐπ' Ἰσαγόρου ἄρχοντος* that Kleisthenes carried his legislation. If that statement be correct, and if the Archon was the Isagoras who had driven Kleisthenes out, we should have to suppose that the rival leaders and factions had come to terms again, and that the constitution of Kleisthenes was the result of a compromise. It would of course have to be dated after the events recorded cc. 74, 75 *infra*.

2. **μεταπεμψάμενοι.** Where they had taken refuge is not recorded: peradventure no farther off than Leipsydrion, cp. c. 62 *supra*, or Delphi. It might be too rash to suggest that they had found their way to Sardes, and prepared the way for the democratic ambassadors. But cp. 6. 125.

3. **συμμαχίην.** It is noticeable that the Athenians make the first advances to the Persian, and those of a friendly kind, and against Sparta. This tradition is not at all likely to be false, though it is fragmentary. What inducement they could offer the Persian is not here indicated. At a later time there was an oracle in circulation in Sparta at least which shows what was possible. Cp. 8. 141, and c. 90 *infra*.

πρὸς *del.* Schweig.

6. **Ἀρταφρένης ὁ Ὑστάσπεος Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος.** The full description has a fine effect, but would perhaps hardly have occurred here (after cc. 25, 30, 31, 32, 33), if this passage were from the same source as those passages. Chronologically the situation in this chapter is prior to all the others, except that in c. 25.

7. **τίνες.** If the inquiry is historical, and if Artaphrenes really asked for the sake of information, it would follow that this embassy preceded the arrival of Hippias at Sardes, c. 96 *infra*. But in any case it is not likely that Artaphrenes was quite ignorant of Athenian affairs, and the formula is suspicious, cp. cc. 13 *supra*, 105 *infra*.

9. **ἀπεκορύφου**, 'put the point to them in a nutshell, as follows.'

10. **ὁ δέ**, *δὲ in apodosi*, cp. c. 40 *supra*, *εἰ δὲ* answering to *εἰ μέν*. The grammar of the passage, combining as it does the structures of the *recta* and *obliqua*, is interesting.

συνετίθετο = *συντίθεσθαι ἔφη*, Krüger, cp. c. 84 *infra*.

11. **ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν βαλόμενοι**, 4. 160.

13. **αἰτίας μεγάλας εἶχον.** Whether

Κλεομένης δὲ ἐπιστάμενος περιυβρίσθαι ἔπεσι καὶ ἔργοισι ὑπ' 74
Ἀθηναίων συνέλεγε ἐκ πάσης Πελοποννήσου στρατόν, οὐ φράζων ἐς τὸ συλλέγει, τίσασθαί τε ἐθέλων τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἰσαγόρην βουλόμενος τύραννον καταστῆσαι· συνεξῆλθε γάρ οἱ οὗτος ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλιος. Κλεομένης τε δὴ στόλῳ μεγάλῳ ἐσέβαλε ἐς Ἐλευσῖνα, καὶ οἱ Βοιωτοὶ ἀπὸ συνθήματος Οἰνόην αἱρέουσι καὶ Ὑσιὰς δήμους τοὺς ἐσχάτους τῆς Ἀττικῆς, Χαλκιδέες τε ἐπὶ

---

matters went so far as a *γραφὴ παραπρεσβείας*, or any judicial proceedings, it is not possible to say. The experience would at least suggest the necessity of providing such for future occasions. On *αἰτίην ἔχειν* c. 70 *supra*.

74. 1. **περιυβρίσθαι.** The account in Aristophanes, *l.c.* c. 72 *supra*, is obviously exaggerated. On the previous showing of Hdt. it is hard to see that the Athenians were to blame. A Spartan king might wish, indeed, to wipe out the discredit of a failure, but the purely personal motive and personal action here ascribed to Kleomenes is not strict or adequate history. The establishment of Democracy at Athens—even in a form which in after days seemed moderate—the return of Kleisthenes, and the possibility of Athenian aggrandisement supported by Persia were reasons sufficient to set the Spartan *Symmachy* in motion. That the Peloponnesian allies were not informed of the destination of the expedition is possible, though the Boeotians were in arms, *ἀπὸ συνθήματος*. Anyway, no superhuman clairvoyance surely was necessary to assign a probable object and goal. That the one king of his own initiative could have set the confederate force in motion, and carried the other king with him, is not to be admitted. To quote this story, or the story of the interview of Kleomenes and Aristagoras, as showing the power of the Spartan king(s) at the close of the sixth century, and the story of the interview of Philippides with the Ephors in 490 (6. 106) or at least the clearer case in 479 B.C. (9. 7 ff. *infra*), as marking the exact date at which even the military mobilisation (*φρουρὰν φαίνειν*) passed to the Ephoralty, is to betray a most naïve unconsciousness of the problematic conditions under which these stories came into existence, and found their way into the work of Hdt., as well as a poor conception of the working of Spartan institutions. See further on the subject, Appendix VII.

4. **τύραννον.** This is the first hint that Isagoras too was aiming at the tyranny, and it seems an afterthought. Isagoras hitherto represents the oligarchic interest. His views may have developed in exile, or the afterthought may be proper to the tradition. In either case the Spartan king is credited with an intention to restore tyranny at Athens, first in the person of Isagoras, and then in the person of Hippias (cc. 90 f. *infra*). The Ἀθην. πολ. makes no mention of this expedition, which broke up at Eleusis: there is no special reason why it should have mentioned an event which left the constitution intact. But it places the final legislation of Kleisthenes at this point *i.e.* after his return (=Hdt. c. 73) and dates it to the archontate of Isagoras (508-7 B.C.). If that representation were correct, Isagoras could not have left Athens, or must have returned, and the events recorded in this chapter would fall later still. It is, however, hardly possible to harmonise the narratives in Hdt. and in the Ἀθ. πολ. If the latter is the better authority for the purely constitutional points, the former may be the better for the external policy and course of events. Cp. Appendix IX.

συνεξῆλθε. The omission of this circumstance in c. 72 is remarkable: it comes in here as an inference.

6. **οἱ Βοιωτοὶ ἀπὸ συνθήματος.** If this be true, the Boeotians obviously must have been informed of the object of the Peloponnesian movement, and are not likely to have acted simply on the king's direction. Chalkis too and perhaps Aigina were astir: cp. *infra*.

7. **δήμους.** There were two Demi of the name of *Oinoe*: 1 (Hippothoontid. cp. Milchhoefer, *op. cit.* p. 31), on the road from Eleusis to Plataea, by Eleutherae. The mention of Hysiae suggests this one.

τὰ ἕτερα ἐσίνοντο ἐπιόντες χώρους τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Ἀθηναῖοι δέ, καίπερ ἀμφιβολίῃ ἐχόμενοι, Βοιωτῶν μὲν καὶ Χαλκιδέων ἐς ὕστερον ἔμελλον μνήμην ποιήσεσθαι, Πελοποννησίοισι δὲ ἐοῦσι ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι
75 *ἀντία ἔθεντο τὰ ὅπλα. μελλόντων δὲ συνάψειν τὰ στρατόπεδα ἐς μάχην, Κορίνθιοι μὲν πρῶτοι σφίσι αὐτοῖσι δόντες λόγον ὡς οὐ ποιέοιεν δίκαια μετεβάλλοντό τε καὶ ἀπαλλάσσοντο, μετὰ δὲ Δημάρητος ὁ Ἀρίστωνος, ἐὼν καὶ οὗτος βασιλεὺς Σπαρτιητέων καὶ συνεξαγαγών τε τὴν στρατιὴν ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος καὶ οὐκ ἐὼν διάφορος ἐν τῷ πρόσθε χρόνῳ Κλεομένεϊ. ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης τῆς διχοστασίης ἐτέθη νόμος ἐν Σπάρτῃ μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἕπεσθαι ἀμφοτέρους*

---

2 (Aiantid. Milchhoefer, p. 34), between Marathon and Aphidnae. The co-operation of the Chalkidians suggests that this one is meant. The inference that *Hysiae* was an Attic Deme is doubtful, nay highly improbable (cp. Hermann's *Lehrbuch*, I. ii.[6] § 77 (117[5])): this passage cannot be taken to justify it. The Demi were older than Kleisthenes (cp. 1. 60), so this passage cannot prove that his new organisation, dated in Ἀθ. π. c. 21 to 508 B.C., was already in existence: even if Hdt. were incapable of an anachronism.

ἐσχάτους. From Athens. Bl. remarks that the order in which Oinoe and Hysiae are mentioned looks as though the story came from an Athenian source. But the order would be the same to a Peloponnesian. Anyway, it is not from a Boeotian, or Euboean: but the argument is hardly necessary to establish Athenian provenance. The action of the Chalkidians might seem to have been unpreconcerted; but the *σύνθημα* was probably passed on to them. What meanwhile were the Aiginetans about? The situation is a suspiciously exact anticipation of the situation about 446 B.C., and the tactics of the Athenians are prophetic. At the later date Aigina was quiescent, having been thoroughly subdued some ten years before (Thuc. 1. 108). Is that the reason why the Aiginetai are missing here? cp. c. 82 *infra*.

75. 2. **Κορίνθιοι.** Oddly enough this service of the Corinthians is not appealed by the Corinthian orator in Thuc. 1. 41.

σφίσι αὐτοῖσι δόντες λόγον. Cp. c. 68 *supra*.

3. **δίκαια.** Justice and expediency not seldom go hand in hand. Aigina not Athens was still the leading commercial rival of Corinth, and it was to the interest of Corinth to favour the rising power of Athens. Cp. 6. 89, and c. 92 *infra*.

μετεβάλλοντο. L. & S. *sub v.* B. II. 2 understand "to change one's purpose." That would rather be *μετέβαλον*. "Wheeled round," *l.c.* 3, and ref., is here preferable. (Cp. c. 68 *supra*.)

5. **συνεξαγαγών.** On the simple initiative of Kleomenes and without knowing the object of the expedition! The presence of Demaratos is not consistent with the rôle assigned to Kleomenes. Cp. Appendix VII. § 8. Ariston was the predecessor of Demaratos, cp. 1. 67, and for his story 6. 61 ff. *infra*.

6. **ἐν τῷ πρόσθε χρόνῳ.** This may have been the first open breach between Kleomenes and Demaratos (cp. 6. 64), but there is some ground for doubting the date given here by Hdt. for the enactment of the law; cp. 6. 82 *infra*, and Appendix VII. § 5.

7. **ἐτέθη νόμος.** On the Spartan legislative procedure we are imperfectly informed. The *νόμος* may have been passed or sanctioned by the Apella, on the proposal of the Ephors, or of the Ephors and Gerusia. Cp. cc. 39 f. *supra*. That the kings should have been thus amenable to the legislature and yet, one or both, have been able to levy war on whom they would, must surely seem improbable. On the date of this *νόμος* cp. previous note. This *νόμος* passed into general recognition, but could not be implicitly relied on (cp. Xen. *Hell.* 5. 3, 10 *ἡ δὲ τῶν Φλιασίων πόλις . . νομίζουσα δ' ἔξω ὄντος Ἀγησιπόλιδος οὐκ ἂν ἐξελθεῖν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς Ἀγησίλαον, οὐδ' ἂν γενέσθαι ὥστε ἅμα ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς βασιλέας ἔξω Σπάρτης εἶναι κτλ.* anno 380 B.C., Grote viii. 67). Pausanias, the Regent, and Leotychides were both absent at the same time

τοὺς βασιλέας ἐξιούσης στρατιῆς· τέως γὰρ ἀμφότεροι εἵποντο· παραλυομένου δὲ τούτων τοῦ ἑτέρου καταλείπεσθαι καὶ τῶν Τυνδαριδέων τὸν ἕτερον· πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ δὴ καὶ οὗτοι ἀμφότεροι ἐπίκλητοί σφι ἐόντες εἵποντο. 76
τότε δὴ ἐν τῇ Ἐλευσῖνι ὁρῶντες οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν συμμάχων τούς τε βασιλέας τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οὐκ ὁμολογέοντας καὶ Κορινθίους ἐκλιπόντας τὴν τάξιν, οἴχοντο καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπαλλασσόμενοι, τέταρτον δὴ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀπικόμενοι Δωριέες, δίς τε ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἐσβαλόντες καὶ δὶς ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ Ἀθηναίων, πρῶτον μὲν ὅτε καὶ Μέγαρα κατοίκισαν· οὗτος ὁ στόλος ἐπὶ Κόδρου βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηναίων ὀρθῶς ἂν καλέοιτο· δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τρίτον ὅτε ἐπὶ Πεισιστρατιδέων ἐξέλασιν ὁρμηθέντες ἐκ Σπάρτης ἀπίκοντο, τέταρτον δὲ τότε ὅτε ἐς Ἐλευσῖνα Κλεομένης ἄγων Πελοποννησίους ἐσέβαλε. οὕτω τέταρτον τότε Δωριέες ἐσέβαλον ἐς Ἀθήνας.

---

in 479 B.C. Pleistarchos, however, the infant king was at home (9. 10). The two kings are despatched on a mission together 6. 73 *infra*, though not perhaps ἐξιούσης στρατιῆς. In cases where one king was in exile the other king would practically have been confined to Sparta, if such a 'law' had been rigidly enforced. The law would favour the employment of citizens in high military commands, especially as the occasions for such employment multiplied. But one is tempted to doubt whether there was any express enactment at this time (or later) upon this subject; whether, in fact, it had not always been the rule for one king to command at a time, and the exception for both to be absent together.

9. **τῶν Τυνδαριδέων.** The ξόανα of Kastor and Polydeukes. The notice preserves an interesting example of fetichism or idolatry. For further examples cp. c. 80 *infra*, 82 ff. *infra*, 6. 82. Stein, indeed, argues that the law cannot have referred to the *statues*, or twin-statue, as its form would not admit of the one figure being separated from the other. In this case we should have here an instance of simple animism, or the invocation of *ghosts*. But were the figures cut out of a solid block? Is it certain they could not be separated? Or could the spirits have been detached from the idols?

76. 3. **Κορινθίους ἐκλιπόντας τὴν τάξιν,** 'the post occupied by the Corinthians deserted.' Cp. μετεβάλλοντο c. 75 *supra*.

4. **τέταρτον** is incorrect: see below.

5. **ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.** The occasion upon which they had come to overthrow the popular constitution (c. 72 *supra*) and departed in disgrace is omitted.

6. **ὅτε καὶ Μέγαρα κατοίκισαν . . ἐπὶ Κόδρου.** Cp. Pausan. 1. 39, 4, Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i. 72 f., i.[2] pp. 219 ff.

8. **δεύτερον.** The expedition under Anchimolios, c. 63 *supra*.

τρίτον. Under Kleomenes, cc. 64, 65 *supra*.

9. **Σπάρτης.** The first expedition mentioned having started not from Sparta, but from some other Dorian stronghold, perhaps Corinth.

τέταρτον should be πέμπτον. The second coming of Kleomenes c. 72 *supra* being τέταρτον in this schedule. But accurate enumeration would have spoilt the balance δὶς ἐπὶ πολέμῳ δὶς ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ.

11. **Ἀθήνας** loosely for Ἀττικήν. Grote, iii. 385, emphasises this occasion as the first *recorded* instance of the action of the Peloponnesian symmachy under Sparta. It was not a success. The omission in this passage of all reference to subsequent invasions of Attica, such as that under Pleistoanax in 446 B.C. (Thuc. 1. 114) and that under Archidamos in 431 B.C. (Thuc. 2. 10 ff.), is all the more remarkable in that Hdt. does elsewhere (9. 73) refer to one, and has a few references to events of the Peloponnesian war. Yet it is tempting to suppose that this list of invasions was compiled not without

77 Διαλυθέντος ὦν τοῦ στόλου τούτου ἀκλεῶς, ἐνθαῦτα Ἀθηναῖοι τίνυσθαι βουλόμενοι πρῶτα στρατηίην ποιεῦνται ἐπὶ Χαλκιδέας. Βοιωτοὶ δὲ τοῖσι Χαλκιδεῦσι βοηθέουσι ἐπὶ τὸν Εὔριπον. Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ ἰδοῦσι τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς ἔδοξε πρότερον τοῖσι Βοιωτοῖσι ἢ τοῖσι Χαλκιδεῦσι ἐπιχειρέειν. συμβάλλουσί τε δὴ τοῖσι Βοιωτοῖσι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ πολλῷ ἐκράτησαν, κάρτα δὲ πολλοὺς φονεύσαντες ἑπτακοσίους αὐτῶν ἐζώγρησαν. τῆς δὲ αὐτῆς ταύτης ἡμέρης οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι διαβάντες ἐς τὴν Εὔβοιαν συμβάλλουσι καὶ τοῖσι Χαλκιδεῦσι, νικήσαντες δὲ καὶ τούτους τετρακισχιλίους κληρούχους ἐπὶ τῶν ἱπποβοτέων τῇ χώρῃ λείπουσι. οἱ δὲ ἱπποβόται ἐκαλέοντο οἱ παχέες τῶν Χαλκιδέων. ὅσους δὲ καὶ τούτων ἐζώγρησαν, ἅμα τοῖσι Βοιωτῶν ἐζωγρημένοισι εἶχον ἐν φυλακῇ [ἐς πέδας] δήσαντες· χρόνῳ δὲ ἔλυσάν σφεας δίμνεως ἀποτιμησά-

---

reference to the events of 431 B.C., or at least to those of 446 B.C.

77. 1. **Ἀθηναῖοι.** Again we miss any indication as of the constitutional preliminaries so of the intellectual authorship of this active foreign policy. Cp. c. 72 *supra*.

2. **στρατηίην ποιεῦνται.** A psephism of the Ekklesia was presumably passed for this vindictive expedition; but the name of the Athenian strategos (or polemarch?) who conducted these operations is unrecorded: not so the analogous campaign of 446 B.C. associated with the name of Perikles. Thuc. 1. 114.

Χαλκιδέας. The men of Chalkis were Ionians. Their hostility to the rising power of Athens might well have had the same commercial grounds as the hostility of Aigina. They had a closer rival in Eretria, a city-state on good terms apparently with Athens. Cp. c. 57 *supra*, 1. 61, 6. 100. These rivalries and friendships were of long standing (cp. c. 99 *infra*). The expansion of Athens under the Peisistratidae was perhaps not welcome in Chalkis, with its interests in Thrace and in the west—interests to which Athens succeeded in virtue of this conquest. Cp. 8. 62, 6. 21 *infra*.

5. **τοῖσι Βοιωτοῖσι.** The alliance with Plataia had probably been consummated just before this time (see 6. 108 and notes there), although Hdt. has not made mention of it, and this alliance sufficiently explains the hostility of the Boeotians. The battle took place presumably close to the Euripos. Its result, here recalled, must have been consoling to the Athenians after Koroneia. (Thuc. 1. 113.)

9. **τετρακισχιλίους.** 4000 kleruchs can scarcely have been left there and then in possession. The establishment of a kleruchy required certain preliminaries, a dogma of the Ekklesia, the appointment of a commission, and so forth. The number too is suspiciously large. Aelian, *V. H.* 6. 1, who tells the story from a different source, has *δισχιλίους* (unfortunately with a *v. l.* *τεσσαράκοντα*) and apparently quotes an inscription set up in the Agora to prove that part of the ground was let (*τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν ἐμίσθωσαν*). It is not clear whether the events should be all dated to the same period or divided between 506 B.C. and 445 B.C. Grote, iii. 387, regarded this kleruchy as the first: but the discovery of the now celebrated Salaminian psephism (*Mitt. des k. a. I.* ix. 1884, pp. 115 ff.) has established the priority of the settlement in the nearer island. Cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i. 547, Hermann, *Lehrbuch*, i.[6] 435.

11. **ἐκαλέοντο.** 'Hippobotae was the name for the men of substance in Chalkis.' **οἱ παχέες**, c. 30 *supra*.

ὅσους. That the number of Boeotian prisoners should be given, and not that of the Chalkidians, is curious.

13. **δίμνεως.** See L. & S. *sub v.* *διμναῖος*. On the accent cp. Chandler, *Gk. Acc.*[2] pp. 4, 152. On the sum cp. 6. 79 *ἄποινα δέ ἐστι Πελοποννησίοισι δύο μνέαι τεταγμέναι κατ' ἄνδρα αἰχμάλωτον ἐκτίνειν*. Cp. Arnold's note to Thuc. 3. 70. The Peloponnesian sum would be reckoned in Aiginetan (heavy) minae.

ἐς πέδας *secl.* Stein.

μενοι. τὰς δὲ πέδας αὐτῶν, ἐν τῇσι ἐδεδέατο, ἀνεκρέμασαν ἐς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν· αἵ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι, κρεμάμεναι ἐκ τειχέων περιπεφλευσμένων πυρὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μήδου, ἀντίον δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἑσπέρην τετραμμένου. καὶ τῶν λύτρων τὴν δεκάτην ἀνέθηκαν ποιησάμενοι τέθριππον χάλκεον· τὸ δὲ ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς ἕστηκε πρῶτον ἐσιόντι ἐς τὰ προπύλαια τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλι· ἐπιγέγραπται δέ οἱ τάδε·

ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες
παῖδες Ἀθηναίων ἔργμασιν ἐν πολέμου,

---

15. **καὶ ἐς ἐμέ.** Naturally here taken to refer to Hdt.'s autopsy, though the phrase in itself is inconclusive (cp. 4. 124, Introduction, p. lxi.). It would be interesting to determine the date of his visit (or visits) to Athens, for which unfortunately he gives no express indication. (Cp. notes *infra.*) The walls that still bore the marks of the Persian conflagration to the eyes of Hdt., if indeed he saw them, can scarcely have been any other walls than the fortification. By the *μέγαρον* turned towards the west Stein understands the Cella of the Polias temple, or Erechtheion (cp. note c. 72 *supra*), and identifies the site of the chains with the northern wall, which the burning of the former Erechtheion may have scorched, 8. 53.

It is a wonder the Boeotians did not carry off these trophies in 480-79 B.C.

18. **δεκάτην.** If a tithe of the ransom was sufficient to make a full-sized quadriga of bronze the number of Chalkidians ransomed must have been considerable, for the Boeotian tithe would only have amounted to 2 T. 20 M. But Pausanias 1. 28, 2 represents the tithe as taken from the Boeotian as well as from the Chalkidic spoil, which is probably correct.

ποιησάμενοι, middle, cp. 4. 88.

19. **ἕστηκε,** present sense.

τὰ προπύλαια. As the great Propylaea were only completed in 433-2 B.C. this passage is generally taken to have been written after that date, and to indicate that Hdt. himself was in Athens after the completion of the building. On the other hand the Akropolis undoubtedly had Propylaea of one kind or another from time immemorial, and the mere expression is not in itself conclusive proof that the work of Mnesikles is here intended, much less that the work was complete when this passage was written. But there is a difficulty in referring the word here to earlier Propylaea, seeing that Hdt. certainly lived long enough to have visited or heard tell of the great building of Mnesikles. It is possible that as originally written the passage referred to an earlier Entrance, but was left untouched, as equally applicable to the later. It may also be observed that Hdt. in describing the siege of the Akropolis in 489 B.C. speaks three times of the *πύλαι* (8. 51-53), but nowhere of Athenian *προπύλαια* save in this passage. The *Ἀθην. πολ.* c. 15 has *τὸ πρόπυλον τῆς ἀκροπόλεως* of the time of Peisistratos. On the Propylaea see Harrison and Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments*, pp. 353 ff., Curtius, *Stadtg.* pp. 147 ff.

21. **ἔθνεα.** By good fortune a fragment of this inscription is extant, *C.I.A.* 1. 334, Hicks, *Manual*, No. 27. The character of the letters shows that the inscription is not older than about 445 B.C. It was areproduction of an older inscription. Cp. *C. I. A.* iv. 2, 334[a]. The whole trophy may have been a reproduction: that a bronze quadriga escaped the spoiler and the fire in 480 B.C., and the 'restorer' later, seems improbable. The situation in 446-5 B.C. (Thuc. 1. 113) would account for a good deal of the interest taken in the older story, for its revival, and commemoration. That the inscription was cut in his own day is not suggested by Hdt., still less that he had ever seen the Akropolis without the Quadriga, or the Quadriga without the inscription. But then the Propylaea are mentioned in an equally casual fashion. Hdt. conceived himself to be writing history not compiling a guide-book.

Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων. The way

δεσμῷ ἐν ἀχλυόεντι σιδηρέῳ ἔσβεσαν ὕβριν·
τῶν ἵππους δεκάτην Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν.

78 Ἀθηναῖοι μέν νυν ηὔξηντο. δηλοῖ δὲ οὐ κατ' ἓν μοῦνον ἀλλὰ πανταχῇ ἡ ἰσηγορίη ὡς ἔστι χρῆμα σπουδαῖον, εἰ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τυραννευόμενοι μὲν οὐδαμῶν τῶν σφέας περιοικεόντων ἦσαν τὰ πολέμια ἀμείνους, ἀπαλλαχθέντες δὲ τυράννων μακρῷ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο. δηλοῖ ὦν ταῦτα ὅτι κατεχόμενοι μὲν ἐθελοκάκεον ὡς δεσπότῃ ἐργαζόμενοι, ἐλευθερωθέντων δὲ αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἑωυτῷ προεθυμέετο κατεργάζεσθαι.

---

in which the 'Chalkideis' are co-ordinated with the Boeotians is a good testimony to the importance of the city. It was a great metropolis. Bergk reads ἐκ πολέμου, *bello confecto* and ἀχνυόεντι (after Hecker) "nam carcer quidem tenebricosus dici poterat, non ferrea vincula." Codices AB have ἀχνυνθέντι and C has ἀχνυθέντι. ἀχνύς = ἄχος.

The quatrain is the composition of Simonides; see Bergk, *Poet. Lyr.* iii.[4] 477.

24. **τῶν**, without the ἀπό. Cp. c. 59 *supra*.

78. 1. **ηὔξηντο**. The tense is remarkable. The αὔξησις had taken place before they could erect such monuments. Cp. c. 66 *supra* Ἀθῆναι, ἐοῦσαι καὶ πρὶν μεγάλαι, τότε ἀπαλλαχθεῖσαι τυράννων ἐγίνοντο μέζονες. This c. 78 might be expected to close the digression, introduced c. 65 *ad fin.* ὅσα δὲ κτλ.

2. **ἰσηγορίη**, political equality: liberty. The symptom for the essence. Compare the account of the rise of Sparta 1. 66.

εἰ κτλ. Hdt.'s logic is a little at fault. His argument goes to prove that tyranny has everywhere, even at Athens, a bad effect, but not directly that ἰσηγορία has everywhere a good effect. For we cannot suppose him to mean that the Athenians were the last men in the world of whom superiority was to be expected (cp. 1. 60). The argument is interesting as (1) positing a close relation between the domestic institutions and the foreign policy and fortunes of a state, (2) ascribing military success to the democratic spirit and constitution. The first position, which is here rather implied in the particular instance than expressly formulated, became a commonplace of Greek political philosophy, and is well illustrated in Polybius' remarks on the Spartan and Roman constitutions: Bk. 6. 3 ff. The second is more disputable: and with the judgment of Hdt. may be contrasted the judgment put by Thucydides into the mouth of Kleon, Bk. 3. 37, though the πρωτεῖα here ascribed to the Athenians is not of course quite the same as the capacity for ἀρχή there denied of them, as a democracy. Great military success, or at least conquest, has generally been associated with monarchic government, for obvious reasons, cp. c. 3 *supra*: and the success of Rome (not exactly a democracy by the way) is no real exception to the rule, regard being had to the special circumstances of the case. But success in the petty warfare of the Greek states might well go to the most high-spirited body of citizen-soldiers: whether ἰσηγορία could acquire or maintain an empire was another question.

5. **ἐθελοκάκεον κτλ.** This passage reads rather like an economical than like a political formula. It is to be remembered that, although here are so clearly stated the effects of servitude and freedom respectively on labour, the ancient world never rose to the application of this principle to domestic and predial slavery. Ancient writers tended to isolate the political from the economical problem, as some moderns have isolated the economic from the political. With the judgment of Hdt. on the effects of liberty Stein cps. Hippokrates *de aer.* 23.

7. **κατεργάζεσθαι**, 'to achieve success,' cp. c. 24 *supra*.

8. **ἔπρησσον**, imperfect; the action being subsequent to that implied in ηὔξηντο *supra ad init.*

Οὗτοι μέν νυν ταῦτα ἔπρησσον. Θηβαῖοι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐς 79
θεὸν ἔπεμπον, βουλόμενοι τίσασθαι Ἀθηναίους. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη ἀπὸ
σφέων μὲν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔφη αὐτοῖσι εἶναι τίσιν, ἐς πολύφημον δὲ
ἐξενείκαντας ἐκέλευε τῶν ἄγχιστα δέεσθαι. ἀπελθόντων ὦν τῶν
θεοπρόπων, ἐξέφερον τὸ χρηστήριον ἁλίην ποιησάμενοι· ὡς ἐπυν-
θάνοντο δὲ λεγόντων αὐτῶν τῶν ἄγχιστα δέεσθαι, εἶπαν οἱ Θηβαῖοι
ἀκούσαντες τούτων "οὐκῶν ἄγχιστα ἡμέων οἰκέουσι Ταναγραῖοί
τε καὶ Κορωναῖοι καὶ Θεσπιέες; καὶ οὗτοί γε ἅμα ἡμῖν αἰεὶ μα-
χόμενοι προθύμως συνδιαφέρουσι τὸν πόλεμον· τί δεῖ τούτων γε
δέεσθαι; ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μὴ οὐ τοῦτο ᾖ τὸ χρηστήριον." τοιαῦτα 80
ἐπιλεγομένων εἶπε δή κοτε μαθών τις "ἐγώ μοι δοκέω συνιέναι
τὸ θέλει λέγειν ἡμῖν τὸ μαντήιον. Ἀσωποῦ λέγονται γενέσθαι
θυγατέρες Θήβη τε καὶ Αἴγινα· τουτέων ἀδελφεῶν ἐουσέων, δοκέω

---

79. 1. **Θηβαῖοι.** Thebes is not one of the states most intimately associated with Delphi, but the legendary connexion went back at least to Oidipus, and the Boeotians were one of the twelve Amphictyonic peoples.

ταῦτα. Events narrated c. 77.

4. **τῶν ἄγχιστα δέεσθαι** might be the latter end of the oracular verse: *ἐς πολύφημον* is also a quotation. Stein suggests that the term was borrowed from *Od.* 2. 150.

5. **ἁλίην.** The word may have been official at Thebes as in Korkyra (*C.I.G.* 1841 ff.), but Hdt. uses it in cases where it is certainly not the technical expression, 1. 125, 7. 134; cp. c. 29 *supra*.

7. **οἰκέουσι.** Tanagra, Koroneia, and Thespiae, east, west, and south of Thebes, and all of great strategic importance in the struggle between Thebes and Athens (Thespiae 8. 50, Tanagra Thuc. 1. 108, Koroneia 1. 113). Plataia (6. 108) and Hysiae (c. 74 *supra*), already in alliance with Athens, are of course omitted.

10. **ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μὴ οὐ τοῦτο ᾖ,** 'we must rather suppose the oracle means something else.' Cp. Plato, *Apol.* 39 *ἀλλὰ μὴ οὐ τοῦτ' ᾖ χαλεπόν, θάνατον ἐκφυγεῖν, ἀλλὰ πολὺ χαλεπώτερον πονηρίαν.* Weber, *Entwickelungsgesch. der Absichtssätze*, pp. 129 f., observes that this case of an independent or absolute sentence expressing fear or apprehension (*selbständige Befürchtungssatz*) is unique in Hdt. Cp. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 265, *ed. maj.*

80. 2. **εἶπε δή,** cp. 6. 37 *μόγις κοτὲ μαθὼν τῶν τις πρεσβυτέρων εἶπε.*

3. **θέλει,** cp. 6. 37 *τὸ θέλει τὸ ἔπος εἶναι.*

Ἀσωποῦ in the mouth of a Boeotian might be supposed to refer to the well-known Boeotian stream; but at least two other historic streams bore the same name, and were probably confounded in legend with the Boeotian: the Asopos of Trachis 7. 199 *et al.*, and the still better known Asopos of Achaia: in honour of which last no doubt was named Asopodoros the Phliasian hipparch at Plataea in 479 B.C., 9. 69. The Asopides fathered upon these streams were numerous. Apollodoros, *Bibliotheca* 3. 12, 6, ascribes two sons and twenty daughters to Asopos. Beside the two here named the most important would be Korkyra. This at least was the Phliasian view: cp. Pausanias 2. 5, 2, the Phliasians claiming all three nymphs for their own Asopos.

λέγονται. The anecdote and interpretation are important as illustrating the utilisation of mythical beliefs for political purposes. Cp. c. 67 *supra*.

4. **Θήβη καὶ Αἴγινα:** so Pindar, *Isth.* 7 (8). 35 ff.—

χρὴ δ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι Θήβαις τραφέντα
Αἰγίνᾳ χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν,
πατρὸς οὕνεκα δίδυμαι γένοντο θύγατρες
Ἀσωπίδων
ὁπλόταται Ζηνί τε ἅδον βασιλέϊ.

Here, moreover, Thebe and Aigina are twins and the latest-born daughters of

ἡμῖν Αἰγινητέων δέεσθαι τὸν θεὸν χρῆσαι τιμωρητήρων γενέσθαι."
καὶ οὐ γάρ τις ταύτης ἀμείνων γνώμη ἐδόκεε φαίνεσθαι, αὐτίκα
πέμψαντες ἐδέοντο Αἰγινητέων ἐπικαλεόμενοι κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριόν
σφι βοηθέειν, ὡς ἐόντων ἀγχίστων· οἱ δέ σφι αἰτέουσι ἐπικουρίην
81 τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμπέμπειν ἔφασαν. πειρησαμένων δὲ τῶν Θηβαίων
κατὰ τὴν συμμαχίην τῶν Αἰακιδέων καὶ τρηχέως περιεφθέντων
ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, αὖτις οἱ Θηβαῖοι πέμψαντες τοὺς μὲν Αἰακίδας
σφι ἀπεδίδοσαν, τῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐδέοντο. Αἰγινῆται δὲ εὐδαιμονίῃ
τε μεγάλῃ ἐπαερθέντες καὶ ἔχθρης παλαιῆς ἀναμνησθέντες ἐχούσης
ἐς Ἀθηναίους, τότε Θηβαίων δεηθέντων πόλεμον ἀκήρυκτον Ἀθη-

Asopos. Aigina was carried away by Zeus to the island previously named Oenone (8. 46), where she becomes mother of Aiakos, Apollodor. 3. 12, 6. The Rape of Aigina was a subject of frequent occurrence in art: at Olympia, Pausan. 5. 22, 4. A bronze Zeus and Aigina at Delphi, id. 10. 13, 3: both offerings of the Phliasians.

9. **τοὺς Αἰακίδας.** (Images of) the sons of Aiakos. Aias and Telamon were located in Salamis (8. 64). (Salamis indeed was a daughter of Asopos: Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 6. 144.) Aiakos and the other Aiakidae in Aigina (8. 64, 83, 84). On the benefit of images, cp. c. 75 *supra*.

81. 2. **τῶν Αἰακιδέων** after *συμμαχίην*. Aiakos and the Aiakidae were at home in Athens too, and could scarcely be expected to give efficient aid to the enemies of Athens. One of the new *Phylae* already bore the name of Aias, cp. c. 66 *supra*, and its Demi were specially thick towards Boeotia; cp. Milchhoeffer, *op. cit.* p. 34. Miltiades son of Kypselos and rival of Peisistratos traced his descent from Aiakos 6. 35, and there was a *τέμενος* dedicated to Aiakos during, or before, the war with Aigina, c. 89 *infra*. Is it possible that the localisation of the Aiantis was determined with a view to the struggle with Boeotia and Aigina?

4. **τῶν δέ,** *sc.* *Αἰγινητῶν*, *δεέσθαι* being constructed with a double genitive, cp. 3. 157.

ἀνδρῶν. As distinguished from the *ξόανα*. Cp. c. 63 *supra*.

εὐδαιμονίῃ μεγάλῃ ἐπαερθέντες. A reason in Herodotean ethics for expecting a catastrophe. Cp. c. 28 *supra*. An Athenian scandal afterwards traced the origin of Aiginetan prosperity to their receiving stolen goods from the Helots at Plataea, and cheating the thieves, 9. 80. But the commercial prosperity of Aigina was of long standing. The Aiginetans had a separate 'close' (dedicated to Zeus) in Naukratis (2. 178). The wealth of Sostratos of Aigina was proverbial 4. 152. The 'Aiginetan' coinage, weights and measures, attested the early wealth and commercial importance of the island, even if at the time in political dependence on Argos, cp. 6. 127. The decline of Argos was accompanied and perhaps in part caused by the emancipation of Aigina, which may probably be connected with the fall of the tyrannis. The *Thalassokratia* of Aigina is dated by C. O. Müller (*Aegineticorum Liber*, p. 88), following and emending Castor, for the twenty years antecedent to the psephism of Themistokles (7. 144), but the date is artificial. The odes of Pindar composed for private Aiginetan patrons—there are eleven extant, falling between 491-450 B.C. (cp. Metzger's *Pindars Siegeslieder*, pp. 324-419)—attest the wealth of the island before its subjugation by Athens. See further, Appendix VIII.

5. **ἀναμνησθέντες.** That they had actually forgotten it, is not likely. However ancient its origin, the feud would not have been out of remembrance in the days when Peisistratos was settling Salamis, purifying Delos, promoting Naxos, befriending Eretria.

ἐχούσης ἐς. A nautical metaphor, specially suitable in this context; cp. 6. 92 *Αἰγιναῖαι νέες . . ἔσχον . . ἐς τὴν Ἀργολίδα χώρην*, cp. c. 33 *supra*. Other passages (1. 191, 2. 53, 6. 2) show that *ἔχειν ἐς* can be used without the metaphorical suggestion—as is natural with a verb so abstract as *ἔχειν*.

6. **πόλεμον ἀκήρυκτον,** 'a war without heralds' may be (1) a war without

ναίοισι ἐπέφερον· ἐπικειμένων γὰρ αὐτῶν Βοιωτοῖσι, ἐπιπλώσαντες μακρῇσι νηυσὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν κατὰ μὲν ἔσυραν Φάληρον κατὰ δὲ τῆς ἄλλης παραλίης πολλοὺς δήμους, ποιεῦντες δὲ ταῦτα μεγάλως Ἀθηναίους ἐσικνέοντο.

Ἡ δὲ ἔχθρη ἡ προοφειλομένη ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν Αἰγινητέων 82
ἐγένετο ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοιῆσδε. Ἐπιδαυρίοισι ἡ γῆ καρπὸν οὐδένα ἀνεδίδου. περὶ ταύτης ὦν τῆς συμφορῆς οἱ Ἐπιδαύριοι ἐχρέωντο ἐν Δελφοῖσι· ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφέας ἐκέλευε Δαμίης τε καὶ Αὐξησίης

---

formal notice, (2) an implacable war (*ἄσπονδος καὶ ἀκήρυκτος*), (3) an irregular guerilla war. The theory, partly based upon this passage, that all wars in Greek history were formally 'declared' is exaggerated: a similar theory obtained in regard to modern times, until disproved by Colonel J. F. Maurice's official pamphlet, *Hostilities without Declaration of War*, London, 1883.

8. **μακρῇσι νηυσί**, war-galleys or long-boats (ships): cp. 1. 163 (*στρόγγυλαι*).

κατὰ μὲν ἔσυραν κτλ. A remarkable tmesis. Cp. 2. 141, 3. 128, 9. 89 *et al.* Kühner, *Ausf. Gram.* § 445, 12 g.

Φάληρον. Cp. c. 63 *supra*, 6. 116.

9. **παραλίη** is technical. Cp. Ἀθ. πολ. c. 21. The Demi here mentioned are of the Kleisthenic organisation: and Phaleron belonged to the Aiantis.

10. **ἐσικνέοντο** is more forcible than the vulgate *ἐσινέοντο*. Cp. 3. 108 *ὁ δὲ ἔχων ὄνυχας θηρίων πολλὸν πάντων ὀξυτάτους ἀμύσσει τὰς μήτρας, αὐξόμενός τε δὴ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐσικνέεται καταγράφων* (*v. l.* *καταγνάφων*).

82. 2. **τοιῆσδε.** There follows the story of the origin of the feud between the Aiginetans and Athenians (cc. 82-88). The feud begins according to Hdt. in a feeling of hostility from the Aiginetans to the Athenians, *ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν Αἰγινητέων* (c. 82), and ends by an *ἔχθρη* of the Athenians to the Aiginetans, *τῆς πρὸς Αἰγινήτας Ἀθηναίοις* (c. 89). The *ἀρχὴ τῆς ἔχθρης* is obviously conceived as long prior to the *πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος* of 506 B.C. or later. It would be interesting to determine its date, if possible. If we were dealing with a tradition free from anachronisms, and of historical contents, we should be taken back to an age when statues were made of wood; when no olives were to be found save in Attica; when Aigina was still subject to Epidauros; when Athenian women still wore the woollen Dorian tunic *à la Corinthienne*, not having yet adopted the *χιτὼν ποδήρης* or *λίνεος*. There are genuine archaic notes in the story (the wooden *ξόανα*, the primitive divinities, and a dim memory of relations between Athens and Epidauros): there are equally obvious anachronisms (the trireme, the system of jurisdiction, the constitutional terminology, perhaps the votive offerings). But the archaic notes are so to speak material, while the anachronisms concern merely points of expression or form. The supernatural touches, the motive of which is apparent, enhance the value of the story, or rather of the versions. Possibly the rivalry of Athens and Aigina went back to prae-Dorian days, when both were members of the Kalaurian Amphiktyony; and the break up of that Confederation, the Dorisation of Aigina, of Epidauros, of Argos, and the secession and survival of Ionian Athens may underlie or colour the tradition. Cp. Appendix VIII.

4. **ἐκέλευε.** Whether this behest is an Apolline response, or carries us back to the days when the Pythia was the prophet of the *πρωτόμαντις Γαῖα* (Aischyl. *Eumen.* 2) is an open question.

Δαμίη and **Αὐξησίη** are food for speculation. *Δαμία* Blakesley takes as equivalent to *Δᾶ μαῖα = Δαμάτηρ*. Rawlinson agrees. Stein connects Damia with *δαμ*, *δαμάω*, Auxesia with *αὔξειν*, and describes the two as agricultural deities (of labour and increase), personifications of the two sides in Demeter: which of course is much the same as Rawlinson's identification of the two with 'Ceres and Proserpine.' Baehr's explanation of *Δαμία* as the people's goddess seems absurd, though no doubt Demeter, like Dionysos, and other rural deities, is eminently popular, and democratic (cp. 8. 65); etymologically, however, there may be a connexion between *δῆμος* and *Δημία* (cp. L. & S. *sub v.* *δῆμος*). A

ἀγάλματα ἱδρύσασθαι καί σφι ἱδρυσαμένοισι ἄμεινον συνοίσεσθαι. ἐπειρώτεον ὦν οἱ Ἐπιδαύριοι κότερα χαλκοῦ ποιέωνται τὰ ἀγάλματα ἢ λίθου· ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οὐδέτερα τούτων ἔα, ἀλλὰ ξύλου ἡμέρης ἐλαίης. ἐδέοντο ὦν οἱ Ἐπιδαύριοι Ἀθηναίων ἐλαίην σφι δοῦναι ταμέσθαι, ἱρωτάτας δὴ κείνας νομίζοντες εἶναι. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὡς ἐλαῖαι ἦσαν ἄλλοθι γῆς οὐδαμοῦ κατὰ χρόνον ἐκεῖνον ἢ ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τοισίδε δώσειν ἔφασαν ἐπ' ᾧ ἀπάξουσι ἔτεος ἑκάστου τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ τε τῇ πολιάδι ἱρὰ καὶ τῷ Ἐρεχθέι. καταινέσαντες δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοισι οἱ Ἐπιδαύριοι τῶν τε ἐδέοντο ἔτυχον καὶ ἀγάλματα ἐκ τῶν ἐλαιέων τουτέων ποιησάμενοι ἱδρύσαντο· καὶ ἥ τε γῆ σφι ἔφερε καρπὸν καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ἐπετέλεον τὰ
83 συνέθεντο. τοῦτον δ' ἔτι τὸν χρόνον καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Αἰγινῆται Ἐπιδαυρίων ἤκουον τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δίκας διαβαίνοντες ἐς Ἐπίδαυρον ἐδίδοσάν τε καὶ ἐλάμβανον παρ' ἀλλήλων οἱ Αἰγινῆται·

---

more fantastic etymology explains *δαμία* (Kretan *ζημία*) as the destructive, *αὐξεσία* as the productive Demeter. Damia was known to the Romans, and identified with the Bona Dea, and the cult of the latter was probably affected by the identification. Paulus, p. 68, damium sacrificium, quod fiebat in operto in honorem Bonae Deae . . . dea quoque ipsa Damia et sacerdos ejus damiatrix appellabatur, quoted in Roscher, *Lexicon*, 943. There was a festival at Tarentum called *Δάμεια*, Hesych. *sub v.* The etymology of *αὐξησία* is pretty plain. In any case we have a pair of Chthonian divinities, worshipped with orgiastic rites, and particularly connected with Epidauros, Troezen, Attica, Old Delphi, Krete, Aigina, Tarentum, and the west. Cp. further, Roscher, *Lexicon*, *sub vv.*

9. **λέγεται.** Perhaps by the Athenians (cp. c. 85 *infra*) who, not content with having the holiest, wanted to have the only olive trees. The formula suggests a doubt, cp. c. 42 *supra*, 4. 184.

12. **τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ . . τῷ Ἐρεχθέι.** In the Erechtheion on the Akropolis was the olive tree which according to the Athenians had been set there as a witness or protest by Athene against Poseidon, 8. 55. Erechtheus (father of Oreithyia and so father-in-law to Boreas, 7. 189) once king, and specially king of the 'Athenians' (8. 44), of the earth earthy (8. 55), associated with Athene Polias on the Akropolis under the form of a snake (cp. 8. 41), though real history was, doubtless, condensed round his name, may well have been originally of the Chthonian and arval order, or at least have had a symbolical significance of that kind. Athene too upon some sides is undoubtedly a rural goddess, or at least has important relations to climate and seasons, and especially the olive crop. Cp. Curtius, *Stadtg.* p. 35. These relations are displayed in the Calendar of Festivals: Skirophoria, Plynteria, Panathenaea, etc. (Cf. A. Mommsen, *Heortologie*, and Roscher, *Lex.* 683.) But these could hardly be the primary or prominent aspects of Athene Polias; and offerings to the Polias and the King suggest more than a merely physico-religious homage. On Erechtheus, cp. Harrison and Verrall, *op. cit.* xlvii. ff. Cp. also notes c. 72 *supra*.

14. **ποιησάμενοι**, c. 77 *supra*.

83. 1. **Αἰγινῆται Ἐπιδαυρίων ἤκουον.** The supremacy of Argos over Aigina would be easier to understand. Did Epidauros succeed to some of the Argive power (on the fall of the Temenids)? Or is the Epidaurian overlordship a false inference from the fact that to get to Argos the men of Aigina would go to Epidauros? In the days of Periandros there was a tyrannis in Epidauros (3. 50-52) which succumbed to the Corinthian, and this event might have promoted the growth of Aiginetan power.

3. **παρ' ἀλλήλων**, *i.e.* suits between two citizens of Aigina were settled before the Epidaurian court. The conditions anticipate and to some extent justify injunctions laid by Athens upon her allies, subjects, colonies, in Hdt.'s own

τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε νέας τε πηξάμενοι καὶ ἀγνωμοσύνῃ χρησάμενοι
ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων. ἅτε δὲ ἐόντες διάφοροι
ἐδηλέοντο αὐτούς, ὥστε θαλασσοκράτορες ἐόντες, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ
ἀγάλματα ταῦτα τῆς τε Δαμίης καὶ τῆς Αὐξησίης ὑπαιρέονται
αὐτῶν, καί σφεα ἐκόμισάν τε καὶ ἱδρύσαντο τῆς σφετέρης χώρης
ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν, τῇ Οἴη μέν ἐστι οὔνομα, στάδια δὲ μάλιστά κῃ
ἀπὸ τῆς πόλιος ὡς εἴκοσι ἀπέχει. ἱδρυσάμενοι δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ
χώρῳ θυσίῃσί τέ σφεα καὶ χοροῖσι γυναικηίοισι κερτομίοισι ἱλά-
σκοντο, χορηγῶν ἀποδεικνυμένων ἑκατέρῃ τῶν δαιμόνων δέκα
ἀνδρῶν· κακῶς δὲ ἠγόρευον οἱ χοροὶ ἄνδρα μὲν οὐδένα, τὰς δὲ
ἐπιχωρίας γυναῖκας. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τοῖσι Ἐπιδαυρίοισι αἱ αὐταὶ
ἱρουργίαι· εἰσὶ δέ σφι καὶ ἄρρητοι ἱρουργίαι. κλεφθέντων δὲ 84
τῶνδε τῶν ἀγαλμάτων οἱ Ἐπιδαύριοι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι τὰ
συνέθεντο οὐκ ἐπετέλεον. πέμψαντες δὲ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐμήνιον
τοῖσι Ἐπιδαυρίοισι· οἱ δὲ ἀπέφαινον λόγῳ ὡς οὐκ ἀδικέοιεν· ὅσον
μὲν γὰρ χρόνον εἶχον τὰ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ἐπιτελέειν τὰ
συνέθεντο, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐστερῆσθαι αὐτῶν, οὐ δίκαιον εἶναι ἀποφέρειν
ἔτι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἔχοντας αὐτὰ Αἰγινήτας πρήσσεσθαι ἐκέλευον.
πρὸς ταῦτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς Αἴγιναν πέμψαντες ἀπαίτεον τὰ
ἀγάλματα· οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται ἔφασαν σφίσι τε καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι
εἶναι οὐδὲν πρῆγμα. Ἀθηναῖοι μέν νυν λέγουσι μετὰ τὴν ἀπαί- 85
τησιν ἀποσταλῆναι τριήρεϊ μιῇ τῶν ἀστῶν τούτους οἳ ἀποπεμ-
φθέντες ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ καὶ ἀπικόμενοι ἐς Αἴγιναν τὰ ἀγάλματα

---

day, but seem somewhat 'advanced' for the date here vaguely presupposed.

4. **ἀγνωμοσύνη** seems the opposite of *σωφροσύνη*: cp. 4. 93, 6. 10.

6. **θαλασσοκράτορες.** The 'thalassokratia' here asserted might be local and relative to Epidauros.

7. **ὑπαιρέονται.** In getting the statues they would get the deities with the blessings they conferred, and deprive their enemies of the same. On this rationale of idolatry cp. cc. 75, 81 *supra*.

11. **ἱλάσκοντο.** It is plain that the Deities were worshipped in Aigina. Cp. c. 88 *infra*. Halikarnassos was colonised from Troezen 7. 99. Hdt. does not speak here as if these rites were observed in his native place. The number of *χοροί* cannot be inferred with certainty from the number of *χορηγοί*. The *ἄρρητοι ἱρουργίαι* might possibly be ceremonies to which men were not admitted. There is no reference in Hdt. to Asklepios and his cult.

84. 3. **οὐκ ἐπετέλεον,** 'were failing to fulfil' might appear to be the meaning of the words; but Palm's suggestion *οὐκέτι* is less harsh with the imperfect, and is adopted by van Herwerden.

4. **ὅσον . . ἐκέλευον.** With the construction, cp. c. 73, ll. 9-11 *supra*.

7. **Αἰγινήτας** looks like a gloss; the sentence would be stronger without it.

85. 1. **λέγουσι.** We have here the clear indication of various and conflicting sources from which the story has been derived: Athenian, Aiginetan, Argive (Epidaurian); but not of the means by which Hdt. arrived at them, or whether he was the first to reduce them to writing. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxvii. ff.

2. **τριήρεϊ.** The first Greek trireme was built according to Thuc. 1. 13 at Corinth, and if Ameinokles was the first builder, the date of the invention might be *circa* 720 B.C. or during the last quarter of the eighth century. But cp. Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships*, p. 4 (1894).

3. **ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ.** The terminology is that of the democratic age, but is no

ταῦτα ὡς σφετέρων ξύλων ἐόντα ἐπειρῶντο ἐκ τῶν βάθρων ἐξανασπᾶν, ἵνα σφέα ἀνακομίσωνται. οὐ δυναμένους δὲ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ αὐτῶν κρατῆσαι, περιβαλόντας σχοινία ἕλκειν τὰ ἀγάλματα, καί σφι ἕλκουσι βροντήν τε καὶ ἅμα τῇ βροντῇ σεισμὸν ἐπιγενέσθαι· τοὺς δὲ τριηρίτας τοὺς ἕλκοντας ὑπὸ τούτων ἀλλοφρονῆσαι, παθόντας δὲ τοῦτο κτείνειν ἀλλήλους ἅτε πολεμίους, ἐς ὃ ἐκ πάντων ἕνα λειφθέντα ἀνακομισθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐς Φάληρον.

86 Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὕτω γενέσθαι λέγουσι, Αἰγινῆται δὲ οὐ μιῇ νηὶ ἀπικέσθαι Ἀθηναίους· μίαν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὀλίγῳ πλεῦνας μιῆς, καὶ εἴ σφισι μὴ ἔτυχον ἐοῦσαι νέες, ἀπαμύνεσθαι ἂν εὐπετέως· ἀλλὰ πολλῇσι νηυσὶ ἐπιπλέειν σφίσι ἐπὶ τὴν χώρην, αὐτοὶ δέ σφι εἶξαι καὶ οὐ ναυμαχῆσαι. οὐκ ἔχουσι δὲ τοῦτο διασημῆναι ἀτρεκέως, οὔτε εἰ ἥσσονες συγγινωσκόμενοι εἶναι τῇ ναυμαχίῃ κατὰ τοῦτο εἶξαν, οὔτε εἰ βουλόμενοι ποιῆσαι οἷόν τι καὶ ἐποίησαν. Ἀθηναίους μέν νυν, ἐπείτε σφι οὐδεὶς ἐς μάχην κατίστατο, ἀποβάντας ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν τράπεσθαι πρὸς τὰ ἀγάλματα, οὐ δυναμένους δὲ ἀνασπάσαι ἐκ τῶν βάθρων αὐτὰ οὕτω δὴ περιβαλομένους σχοινία ἕλκειν, ἐς οὗ ἑλκόμενα τὰ ἀγάλματα ἀμφότερα τὠυτὸ ποιῆσαι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἄλλῳ δέ τεῳ· ἐς γούνατα γάρ σφι αὐτὰ πεσεῖν, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τούτου χρόνον διατελέειν οὕτω ἔχοντα. Ἀθηναίους μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ποιέειν· σφέας δὲ Αἰγινῆται λέγουσι πυθομένους τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὡς μέλλοιεν ἐπὶ σφέας στρατεύεσθαι, ἑτοίμους Ἀργείους ποιέεσθαι. τούς τε δὴ Ἀθηναίους ἀποβεβάναι ἐς τὴν

---

real indication of the epoch or state of the government (note to c. 82 *supra*). Cp. 6. 50. On the story which follows Rawlinson remarks that similar stories are frequent in Pausanias: see 1. 18, 2 (madness of Agraulos and Herse in consequence of an act of disobedience—not a close parallel); 3. 16, 6 (*sc.* 9), madness produced by the *ξόανον* of Artemis Orthias at Sparta; 7. 19, 3 *μήνιμα ἐξ Ἀρτέμιδος* for a sacrilege. He compares also the tale in Athenaeus p. 672 B, the attempted rape of the statue (*βρέτας*) of Hera from Samos, and the marvel by which it was prevented—a good parallel, though the Samian story might be merely a fiction to explain the ritualistic washing of the image (cp. Athenian Plynteria). R. adds the story of the preservation of Delphi, 8. 37, which offers many points of comparison. Such coincidences explain the genesis and discredit the truth of all the narratives alike: nor can any higher probability be claimed for the eldest of the series, when it involves physical absurdities. (Cp. the story cc. 17 ff. *supra* in which case no physical ineptitudes are involved.)

86. 5. **οὐκ ἔχουσι.** As if Hdt. had cross-questioned some Aiginetans on the subject! He may, however, be repeating Athenian criticism. He seems to prefer the Athenian version, as he points out carefully two weak spots in the Aiginetan, and fails to suggest that the other had been dictated by Athenian pride, which preferred to ascribe a defeat to the *δαιμόνιον* rather than to the men of Argos or Aigina. The case well illustrates one canon of Greek history, as made by the Greeks themselves.

11. **ἐμοὶ μὲν κτλ.** One of Hdt.'s tolerant formulae. Cp. Introduction, § 22.

12. **γούνατα.** The *ξόανα* presumably were kneeling figures, and their attitude lent itself to this interpretation. The *βρέτας* of Hera (Athenaeus, *l.c. supra*) not being a kneeling figure became miraculously heavy, and so defeated the intention of the robbers. Cp. c. 88 *infra*.

*Αἰγιναίην, καὶ ἥκειν βοηθέοντάς σφισι τοὺς Ἀργείους καὶ λαθεῖν
τε ἐξ Ἐπιδαύρου διαβάντας ἐς τὴν νῆσον καὶ οὐ προακηκοόσι τοῖσι
Ἀθηναίοισι ἐπιπεσεῖν ὑποταμομένους τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν, ἅμα τε ἐν
τούτῳ τὴν βροντήν τε γενέσθαι καὶ τὸν σεισμὸν αὐτοῖσι. λέγεται* 87
*μέν νυν ὑπ᾽ Ἀργείων τε καὶ Αἰγινητέων τάδε, ὁμολογέεται δὲ καὶ
ὑπ᾽ Ἀθηναίων ἕνα μοῦνον τὸν ἀποσωθέντα αὐτῶν ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν
γενέσθαι· πλὴν Ἀργεῖοι μὲν λέγουσι αὐτῶν τὸ Ἀττικὸν στρα-
τόπεδον διαφθειράντων τὸν ἕνα τοῦτον περιγενέσθαι, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ
τοῦ δαιμονίου· περιγενέσθαι μέντοι οὐδὲ τοῦτον τὸν ἕνα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπ-
ολέσθαι τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. κομισθεὶς ἄρα ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀπήγγελλε
τὸ πάθος· πυθομένας δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας τῶν ἐπ᾽ Αἴγιναν στρατευ-
σαμένων ἀνδρῶν, δεινόν τι ποιησαμένας κεῖνον μοῦνον ἐξ ἁπάντων
σωθῆναι, πέριξ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον λαβούσας καὶ κεντεύσας τῇσι
περόνῃσι τῶν ἱματίων εἰρωτᾶν ἑκάστην αὐτέων ὅκου εἴη ὁ ἑωυτῆς
ἀνήρ. καὶ τοῦτον μὲν οὕτω διαφθαρῆναι, Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ ἔτι τοῦ* 88
*πάθεος δεινότερόν τι δόξαι εἶναι τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἔργον. ἄλλῳ
μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἔχειν ὅτεῳ ζημιώσωσι τὰς γυναῖκας, τὴν δὲ ἐσθῆτα*

---

18. **ἐξ Ἐπιδαύρου.** The Dorian states Argos, Epidauros, Aigina appear in league against Athens: for, if Epidauros had been at the time friendly to Athens, the Athenians would probably have had news of the Argive movement, if it had not been altogether frustrated.

87. 4. **Ἀργεῖοι.** The appearance of the Argives as the authority for the story at this point may be due to the fact that the destruction of the Attic force on land was especially the work of the Argives. It might be conjectured that the Aiginetans were engaged at sea, and that their Peloponnesian allies undertook operations on shore. One survivor in a battle might more or less easily make his way from place to place on dry land (cp. 1. 82 case of Othryades: and the no less immortal case of Dr. Brydon the one survivor who reached Jellalabad from Cabul in 1842); but it would be interesting to know how the one Athenian made his way across the water from Aigina to Attica, unless he was actually sent by the enemy to bear the news (*κομισθεὶς ἄρα ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας*).

11. **ἱματίων.** The himation properly so called was an upper garment, for out-door wear, and it is doubtful whether it was ever fastened with pins or brooches (cp. Blümner in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, *s. v.*); and, by the way, the reference in L. & S. *sub v.* *περόνη* to Sophokles *O. T.* 1269 is not to the point, seeing that the garment or garments (*εἵματα*) there mentioned need not have included an himation. In any case *ἱματίων* here can scarcely stand for *κιθώνων*, unless Hdt. is to be charged with supernormal laxity. It is more probable that he slipped in regard to the historical evolution of feminine apparel than as to the correct use of ordinary terms for various articles as worn in his own time. But cp. next note but one, c. 92 η *infra* and 1. 9. By *ἱματίων* he here in any case probably means out-door garments, which he supposes were formerly secured by brooches: and just below he argues, rather loosely, that the long linen chiton was substituted for the short woollen chiton in the dress of Athenian women, in order that pins and brooches might be discarded altogether.

88. 2. **τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἔργον.** An act worthy of Lemnians (see 6. 138). But for the horror of the Athenians, and the consequent change of fashion, it might have been suspected that this act of the women was historical, and even the execution of a judicial sentence. In any case the fate of this nameless Athenian forms a remarkable parallel, by anticipation, to the lynching of Lykidas in 479 B.C. as narrated 9. 5. For the latter only the men were responsible; and no horror seems to have been felt.

μετέβαλον αὐτέων ἐς τὴν Ἰάδα· ἐφόρεον γὰρ δὴ πρὸ τοῦ αἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκες ἐσθῆτα Δωρίδα, τῇ Κορινθίῃ παραπλησιωτάτην· μετέβαλον ὦν ἐς τὸν λίνεον κιθῶνα, ἵνα δὴ περόνῃσι μὴ χρέωνται. ἔστι δὲ ἀληθέι λόγῳ χρεωμένοισι οὐκ Ἰὰς αὕτη ἡ ἐσθὴς τὸ παλαιὸν ἀλλὰ Κάειρα, ἐπεὶ ἥ γε Ἑλληνικὴ ἐσθὴς πᾶσα ἡ ἀρχαίη τῶν γυναικῶν ἡ αὐτὴ ἦν τὴν νῦν Δωρίδα καλέομεν. τοῖσι δὲ Ἀργείοισι καὶ τοῖσι Αἰγινήτῃσι καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα [ἔτι τόδε ποιῆσαι] νόμον εἶναι παρά σφισι ἑκατέροισι τὰς περόνας ἡμιολίας ποιέεσθαι τοῦ τότε κατεστεῶτος μέτρου, καὶ ἐς τὸ ἱρὸν τῶν θεῶν τουτέων περόνας μάλιστα ἀνατιθέναι τὰς γυναῖκας, Ἀττικὸν δὲ

---

4. **ἐφόρεον.** The history of woman's dress here indicated is simple. Originally all Hellenic women wore vestments of the same stuff and pattern, viz. of woollen stuff and fastened with pins, clasps, or brooches; subsequently the long Karian linen chiton was introduced by the Ionians (presumably from Asia) and adopted by the Athenians; the two types were then contrasted as Ionian and Dorian.

As a native of an Ionised Doric colony in Karia Hdt. ranks as a good authority on this subject: but it must be questioned whether his historical sketch is either complete or accurate. Only by an undue restriction of the term Hellenic could the primitive dress of Hellenic women be identified with the Dorian chiton: the Homeric Peplos, the representation of the under garment on early vases, resembles rather the long (Ionian) chiton. Nor is it quite clear whether Hdt. is speaking of the upper or under garment, or of both: though in c. 87 the περόναι are taken from the ἱμάτια. (Blümner, in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, p. 786, seems to identify Hdt.'s Iono-Karian raiment with a costume made up of two garments, while evidently sceptical as to the correctness of Hdt.'s statement.) Nor does it appear that the long (linen) chiton always dispensed with περόναι, and in any case the statement that the Athenians adopted the long chiton in order to get rid of the περόναι τῶν ἱματίων is somewhat inconsequent. It is to be observed that Thucydides, a better authority for Athenian fashions, has a complementary note on the history of men's dress at Athens, 1. 6. The men had recently given up wearing the old-fashioned linen chiton and adopted the Dorian. Thucydides seems to imply that the so-called 'Ionian' chiton was properly 'Attic': on this point Hdt. is probably nearer the truth. This passage has of course extraordinary interest as the oldest extant deliberate essay on the history of Greek dress, a subject into the earlier chapters of which historic light has but lately fallen. The evidence now available is mainly the archaic pottery (Mykenaean and early Attic), and goes to show, *inter alia*, that Hdt.'s account of the matter is much too simple. Nor can it well be supposed that it was on a careful examination of such evidence that his account was based. For the recent growth of knowledge in this department cp. Blümner, in Hermann's *Lehrbuch*, iv.[3] §§ 21, 22 (1882), Helbig, *Das Homerische Epos*, 1884 (2nd Ed. 1887), Boehlau, *Quaestiones de re vestiaria Graecorum*, 1884, Studniczka, *Beiträge z. Geschichte der altg. Tracht*, 1886, Evans (Lady), *Chapters on Greek Dress* (1894).

11. **νόμον.** There are three customs here stated to have been instituted in consequence of this feud with Athens: (1) the enlargement of the pins, (2) the practice of offering these large pins to Damia and Auxesia, (3) the exclusion of Attic ware from the cult. The last may possibly be an understatement and pseudo-explanation of a commercial measure or custom for the protection of native wares from Attic competition. The pins or brooches were no doubt common offerings to the goddesses perhaps before marriage (Stein cps. 4. 34) or childbirth. (Hence the kneeling posture of the figures. Welcker as quoted by Stein refers to the kneeling Eileithyia at Tegea, Pausan. 8. 48, 7, and the description of Leto, *Hymn. ad Apoll.* 117.) The ritualistic facts are probably correct: the reasons given therefor highly suspicious.

12. **ποιέεσθαι**, middle. Cp. c. 82 *supra*.

μήτε τι ἄλλο προσφέρειν πρὸς τὸ ἱρὸν μήτε κέραμον, ἀλλ' ἐκ χυτρίδων ἐπιχωριέων νόμον τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτόθι εἶναι πίνειν.

89 Ἀργείων μέν νυν καὶ Αἰγινητέων αἱ γυναῖκες ἐκ τόσου κατ' ἔριν τὴν Ἀθηναίων περόνας ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἐφόρεον μέζονας ἢ πρὸ τοῦ, τῆς δὲ ἔχθρης τῆς πρὸς Αἰγινήτας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων γενομένης ἀρχὴ κατὰ τὰ εἴρηται ἐγένετο. τότε δὲ Θηβαίων ἐπικαλεομένων, προθύμως τῶν περὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα γενομένων ἀναμιμνησκόμενοι οἱ Αἰγινῆται ἐβοήθεον τοῖσι Βοιωτοῖσι. Αἰγινῆταί τε δὴ ἐδήιουν τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὰ παραθαλάσσια, καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ὁρμημένοισι ἐπ' Αἰγινήτας στρατεύεσθαι ἦλθε μαντήιον ἐκ Δελφῶν, ἐπισχόντας ἀπὸ τοῦ Αἰγινητέων ἀδικίου τριήκοντα ἔτεα, τῷ ἑνὶ καὶ τριηκοστῷ Αἰακῷ τέμενος ἀποδέξαντας ἄρχεσθαι τοῦ πρὸς Αἰγινήτας πολέμου, καί σφι χωρήσειν τὰ βούλονται· ἢν δὲ αὐτίκα ἐπιστρατεύωνται, πολλὰ μέν σφεας ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τοῦ χρόνου πείσεσθαι πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ποιήσειν, τέλος μέντοι καταστρέψεσθαι. ταῦτα ὡς ἀπενειχθέντα ἤκουσαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τῷ μὲν Αἰακῷ τέμενος ἀπέδεξαν τοῦτο τὸ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορῆς ἵδρυται, τριήκοντα δὲ ἔτεα οὐκ ἀνέσχοντο ἀκούσαντες ὅκως χρεὸν εἴη ἐπισχεῖν πεπονθότας ὑπ' Αἰγινητέων ἀνάρσια. 90 ἐς τιμωρίην δὲ παρασκευαζομένοισι αὐτοῖσι ἐκ Λακεδαιμονίων πρῆγμα ἐγειρόμενον ἐμπόδιον ἐγένετο. πυθό-

---

89. 1. **ἐκ τόσου**, *sc.* χρόνου, but unfortunately the date is vague. The remark would be devoid of point unless Hdt. conceived of the events just narrated as long antecedent to his own day.

2. **ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ.** One of Hdt.'s formulae (cp. c. 77 *supra*), but not conclusive evidence of autopsy, nor of any recent change in Aiginetan and Argive fashions. Cp. Introduction, § 16, III.

πρὸ τοῦ. Hdt. accepts the story though it does not appear what evidence he had for the previous or primitive custom. *τοῦ* is the point of time from which *τόσου* just above begins.

4. **τότε**, c. 81 *supra, circa* 506 B.C.

5. **ἀναμιμνησκόμενοι.** It was an old story even before the beginning of the fifth century. (Recalling the affair of the statues is not quite the same as *ἔχθρης ἀναμνησθέντες* c. 81 *supra*.)

7. **παραθαλάσσια.** The phraseology is less technical and less Attic than in c. 81 *supra*.

8. **ἦλθε.** Not surely spontaneously, but in answer to their inquiries. But is the oracle correctly dated? The cult of Aiakos is suggestive of Philaid auspices: the actual date of the conquest of Aigina is 456 B.C. (Thuc. 1. 108). Thirty-one years from that date carries us back to 486-7 B.C. the probable date of the great Aiginetan war, misplaced by Hdt. *infra*, 6. 87 ff. See notes there. It does not seem likely that the shrine of Aiakos in the Agora, seen by Hdt., was a survival from the prae-Persian days. For some thirty years after 487 B.C. the Athenians and Aiginetans were at peace. The oracle here preserved belongs presumably to a date just about the time when Athens was at war with Aigina (Epidauros and Corinth), when Kimon perhaps was in exile, and his recall being agitated. A descendant of Aiakos was the proper man to bring the Aiginetans to reason. Kimon was probably not recalled till after the Egyptian disaster in 455 B.C. (C. Peter, *Zeittafeln*[5], *ad ann.* 457-6, dates his recall before the fall of Aigina); but the events and interests of that period have tinged the traditions of the older *ἔχθρα*.

90. 2. **πρῆγμα.** The Athenians (it would seem) were well informed concerning the movements of Hippias, and of the Peloponnesians! As the Spartan project proved a fiasco it need hardly have hindered long their attack on Aigina. A real impediment may have

μενοι γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰ ἐκ τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδέων ἐς τὴν Πυθίην μεμηχανημένα καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς Πυθίης ἐπὶ σφέας τε καὶ τοὺς Πεισιστρατίδας συμφορὴν ἐποιεῦντο διπλῆν, ὅτι τε ἄνδρας ξείνους σφίσι ἐόντας ἐξεληλάκεσαν ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων, καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα ποιήσασι χάρις οὐδεμία ἐφαίνετο πρὸς Ἀθηναίων. ἔτι τε πρὸς τούτοισι ἐνῆγόν σφεας οἱ χρησμοὶ λέγοντες πολλά τε καὶ ἀνάρσια ἔσεσθαι αὐτοῖσι ἐξ Ἀθηναίων, τῶν πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν ἀδαέες, τότε δὲ Κλεομένεος κομίσαντος ἐς Σπάρτην ἐξέμαθον. ἐκτήσατο δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐκ τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἀκροπόλιος τοὺς χρησμούς, τοὺς ἔκτηντο μὲν πρότερον οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι, ἐξελαυνόμενοι δὲ ἔλιπον
91 ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ, καταλειφθέντας δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἀνέλαβε. τότε δὲ ὡς
ἀνέλαβον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοὺς χρησμοὺς καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὥρων αὐξομένους καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἑτοίμους ἐόντας πείθεσθαί σφισι, νόῳ λαβόντες ὡς ἐλεύθερον μὲν ἐὸν τὸ γένος τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἰσόρροπον ἂν τῷ ἑωυτῶν γίνοιτο, κατεχόμενον δὲ ὑπὸ τυραννίδος ἀσθενὲς καὶ πειθαρχέεσθαι ἕτοιμον· μαθόντες δὲ τούτων ἕκαστα μετεπέμποντο Ἱππίην τὸν Πεισιστράτου ἀπὸ Σιγείου τοῦ ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ [ἐς ὃ

---

been created by the relations at Sardes, cp. c. 96 *infra*, and Appendix VIII. § 3.

3. **Λακεδαιμόνιοι.** Kings, Ephors, Gerusia, Apella? Kleomenes was presumably in favour of the policy, but Hdt. unfortunately throws no light upon the constitutional procedure. From the analogous case in 432 B.C. it might be conjectured that the matter was settled in the Spartan Apella, before the allies were summoned to vote. Cp. Thuc. 1. 67, 79, 87, 119.

τὰ ἐκ τ. Ἀ., cc. 62, 63, 66 *supra*.

4. **τὰ ἐκ τ. Π.**, c. 63 *supra*.

7. **χάρις.** The 'ingratitude' of the Athenians consisted in their not conducting their affairs in subordination to Spartan interests, c. 91 *infra*. States have been guilty of similar 'ingratitude' within living memory!

8. **χρησμοί.** These oracles, if authentic, would seem to imply that, under the Peisistratids, Athens was already entering into competition with Sparta, or at least looking forward thereto. Or were these oracles—'left in the temple by the Peisistratidae'—intended to alarm the Spartans and promote just such a reaction as is here described? That they were not of Delphic origin is obvious. On Peisistratid piety cp. c. 56 *supra*, and as a later example of a prophecy of similar content cp. 8. 141, later, that is, unless the oracle there cited belong to the date of Athenian overtures to the Mede (c. 73 *supra*).

91. 4. **νόῳ λαβόντες ὡς.** This sentence, ascribing a truly Machiavellian policy and morality to the Lakedaemonians, is more in the mode of Thucydides. It can hardly be an uninspired observation on the part of Hdt., still less one suggested by a Spartan source. It is, perhaps, an Athenian view, and contrasts with the taunt of *ἀμαθία πρὸς τὰ ἔξω πράγματα* brought against the Spartans by the Corinthian orator in Thuc. 1. 68. A small oligarchy, indeed, Sparta preferred to the tyrannis, as she showed abundantly in the Peloponnesian war and thereafter; but her essential objection to the tyrannis was strictly local, for Laconia, or at most Peloponnesos, and did not extend to Attica, Sicily, or Macedon, much less to merely 'barbarous' nations.

τὸ γένος τὸ Ἀττικόν. This phrase may be taken to mark the repudiation of Ionism. Cp. 1. 57, 59 (*τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος*) and c. 69 *supra*.

5. **κατεχόμενον.** Cp. 1. 59 *κατεχόμενόν τε καὶ διεσπασμένον ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου*.

7. **Σιγείου.** Cp. cc. 65 *supra*, 94 *infra*. The topographical indication here is less precise than there. There seems to have been no other Sigeion.

ἐς ὃ κτλ. *del.* Wesseling.

καταφεύγουσι οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι]. ἐπείτε δέ σφι Ἱππίης καλεόμενος ἧκε, μεταπεμψάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων ἀγγέλους ἔλεγόν σφι Σπαρτιῆται τάδε. "ἄνδρες σύμμαχοι, συγγινώσκομεν αὐτοῖσι ἡμῖν οὐ ποιήσασι ὀρθῶς· ἐπαερθέντες γὰρ κιβδήλοισι μαντηίοισι ἄνδρας ξείνους ἐόντας ἡμῖν τὰ μάλιστα καὶ ἀναδεκομένους ὑποχειρίας παρέξειν τὰς Ἀθήνας, τούτους ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἐξηλάσαμεν, καὶ ἔπειτα ποιήσαντες ταῦτα δήμῳ ἀχαρίστῳ παρεδώκαμεν τὴν πόλιν· ὃς ἐπείτε δι' ἡμέας ἐλευθερωθεὶς ἀνέκυψε, ἡμέας μὲν καὶ τὸν βασιλέα ἡμέων περιυβρίσας ἐξέβαλε, δόξαν δὲ φύσας αὐξάνεται, ὥστε ἐκμεμαθήκασι μάλιστα μὲν οἱ περίοικοι αὐτῶν Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Χαλκιδέες, τάχα δέ τις καὶ ἄλλος ἐκμαθήσεται ἁμαρτών. ἐπείτε δὲ ἐκεῖνα ποιήσαντες ἡμάρτομεν, νῦν πειρησόμεθά σφεας ἅμα ὑμῖν ἀπικόμενοι τίσασθαι· αὐτοῦ γὰρ τούτου εἵνεκεν τόνδε τε Ἱππίην μετεπεμψάμεθα καὶ ὑμέας ἀπὸ τῶν πολίων, ἵνα κοινῷ τε λόγῳ καὶ κοινῷ στόλῳ ἐσαγαγόντες αὐτὸν ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀποδῶμεν τὰ καὶ ἀπειλόμεθα."

Οἱ μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεγον, τῶν δὲ συμμάχων τὸ πλῆθος οὐκ ἐνεδέ- 92
κετο τοὺς λόγους. οἱ μέν νυν ἄλλοι ἡσυχίην ἦγον, Κορίνθιος δὲ
Σωκλέης ἔλεξε τάδε. "ἦ δὴ ὅ τε οὐρανὸς ἔνερθε ἔσται τῆς γῆς a)
καὶ ἡ γῆ μετέωρος ὑπὲρ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἄνθρωποι νομὸν ἐν
θαλάσσῃ ἕξουσι καὶ ἰχθύες τὸν πρότερον ἄνθρωποι, ὅτε γε ὑμεῖς

---

9. **τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων**: 'the allies as well.' Cp. c. 32 *supra*, 4. 191.

10. **Σπαρτιῆται.** The speech shows that the king himself was not the spokesman: not of course that the speech is authentic: it has a clear Attic sound (esp. *τάχα δέ τις κτλ.*)

13. **ὑποχειρίας παρέξειν τὰς Ἀθήνας.** Such a condition in Athens never suited the interest of Corinth, better served by a balance of power within and without the Peloponnesos. Hence the line taken by Corinth on this occasion, and many others. Cp. cc. 75 *supra*, 93 *infra*.

14. **δήμῳ ἀχαρίστῳ.** Cp. c. 90 *supra*.

17. **αὐξάνεται.** Cp. *ηὔξηντο* c. 78 *supra*. The establishment of the democracy and the growth of the power of Athens fully justified the apprehensions here dramatically expressed, which make it wonderful, not that Sparta moved reluctantly to the help of Athens against the Persian, but that she moved at all. But both her inaction and her action are thoroughly intelligible. See Appendix VII. § 11.

20. Van H. reads *σφεα ἅμα ὑμῖν ἀκεόμενοι·* partially justified by *ἀκεόμενοι* for *ἀπικ. τίσασθαι* in V′, but against aP (Holder).

92. 1. **οὐκ ἐνεδέκετο τοὺς λόγους**, 'was for rejecting the proposals.' Cp. cc. 96, 98 *infra*, *τὸν λόγον* 106 *infra*, *δέκεσθαι* 6. 13.

3. **τάδε.** The contrast between Hdt. and Thuc., and the types of almost contemporaneous culture which they respectively represent, is nowhere more conspicuous than in the speeches introduced in their several narratives. Even in his speeches Hdt. does not always cease to be a story-teller (cp. 6. 86), nor his style decline from the *εἰρομένη λέξις*, least of all in this, his longest oration. A certain air of authenticity is lent to the passage by the introduction of the speaker's name: but that this device is no final guarantee is proved by the parallel case of the speeches 3. 80 ff. (Deliberation of the seven Persians on the best form of government). That Sokles is an historical person need not be doubted, still less that the Corinthians on this occasion led the opposition to Sparta.

§ a l. 3. **οὐρανός.** The *οὐρανὸς* is here apparently conceived as a solid and im-

ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἰσοκρατίας καταλύοντες τυραννίδας ἐς τὰς πόλις
κατάγειν παρασκευάζεσθε, τοῦ οὔτε ἀδικώτερόν ἐστι οὐδὲν κατ᾽
ἀνθρώπους οὔτε μιαιφονώτερον. εἰ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτό γε δοκέει ὑμῖν
εἶναι χρηστὸν ὥστε τυραννεύεσθαι τὰς πόλις, αὐτοὶ πρῶτοι
τύραννον καταστησάμενοι παρὰ σφίσι αὐτοῖσι οὕτω καὶ τοῖσι
ἄλλοισι δίζησθε κατιστάναι· νῦν δὲ αὐτοὶ τυράννων ἄπειροι
ἐόντες, καὶ φυλάσσοντες τοῦτο δεινότατα ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ μὴ γενέ-
σθαι, παραχρᾶσθε ἐς τοὺς συμμάχους. εἰ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔμπειροι ἔατε
κατά περ ἡμεῖς, εἴχετε ἂν περὶ αὐτοῦ γνώμας ἀμείνονας συμβαλέ-
β) σθαι ἤ περ νῦν. Κορινθίοισι γὰρ ἦν πόλιος κατάστασις τοιήδε·
ἦν ὀλιγαρχίη, καὶ οὗτοι Βακχιάδαι καλεόμενοι ἔνεμον τὴν πόλιν,

---

movable hemisphere: the γῆ (here including θάλασσα) presumably as a flat surface. This may be taken to indicate the conception of Hdt. himself. Cp. 4. 36.

6. **ἰσοκρατίαι.** Free constitutions, 'Republics.' The term would probably have included both oligarchy (aristocracy) and democracy. A Corinthian can hardly be supposed to be pleading the cause of democracy as such. Cp. ἰσηγορίη as used c. 78 *supra*, ἰσονομίη 3. 142. The conduct of the Corinthians themselves did not always correspond to the liberal sentiments here ascribed to them. Cp. their restoration of Evarchos at Astakos in 431 B.C., Thuc. 2. 33. (The Athenians were not in a position to complain: cp. Thuc. 1. 111, *anno* 454 B.C.)

τυραννίδας ἐς τὰς πόλις. A rhetorical exaggeration calculated to alarm the silent allies. (To an Athenian the expression αἱ πόλεις would mean the Symmachi, as just below.)

7. **τοῦ,** *sc.* χρήματος, *i.e.* τυραννίδος out of the plural preceding, not, of course, what the grammar rather demands, τοῦ κατάγειν κτλ. The speaker's excitement is beyond grammar. Cp. c. **65** *supra*.

11. **τυράννων ἄπειροι.** The Spartans in their own case had almost as little (and as late) experience of the Tyrannis as the Corinthians of Democracy. Not until the days of the usurping adventurers, Lykurgos, Machanidas and Nabis (to waive the cases of Agis IV. and Kleomenes III.), did the Tyrannis technically occupy Sparta. Cp. Plass, *Die Tyrannis* (1859), ii. pp. 171 ff., C. Peter, *Gr. Zeittafeln*[5], *ad ann.* 195-192 B.C. But the Spartans, of course, knew perfectly well the reputed and the real effects of Tyranny, and for that very reason were anxious to avoid it at home, and to re-establish it in Athens; c. 91 *supra*.

12. **φυλάσσοντες κτλ.** This was undoubtedly one of the guiding principles of Spartan policy, for the danger was there. Hence the treatment of Kleomenes, Pausanias, perhaps Leotychides and others. Hence, indeed, the very maintenance of the dual kingdom. The remark of the speaker implies that the Spartans had knowledge of the nature of the Tyrannis, even if they had no empirical knowledge, and thus renders his subsequent narrative superfluous. But the whole argument is beside the point: the Corinthian had to show that it was against Sparta's interests to establish a Tyrant in Athens; this he fails, he does not even attempt, to do—except in so far as his attitude shows the hostility of Corinth to the Spartan proposal. The fact probably is that Hdt. takes occasion to put on record a good story, or rather three good stories (1) the preservation of Kypselos, (2) the advice of Thrasybulos, (3) the ghost of Melissa.

§ **β** l. 15. **ἦν,** and was again in the speaker's own day: but the Bakchiadae were no longer in possession, and the hateful name of oligarchy was perhaps avoided. The Bakchiad régime supplies a good example of the δυναστεία of Thuc. 3. 62.

πόλιος κατάστασις = πολιτεία, so in technical writers (*e.g.* 'Αθ. πολ. c. 41 *et passim*).

16. **Βακχιάδαι.** The rationalised synthesis of traditions on the subject was to this effect. Under Aletes, the Herakleid, the Dorians had made good their position in Corinth. (Cp. Thuc. 4. 42, Pausan. 2. 4.) The fourth king in descent from Aletes was named Bakchis. His power was so great that the clan took his name. After a succession of four more kings royalty gave way to

ἐδίδοσαν δὲ καὶ ἤγοντο ἐξ ἀλλήλων. Ἀμφίονι δὲ ἐόντι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν γίνεται θυγάτηρ χωλή· οὔνομα δέ οἱ ἦν Λάβδα. ταύτην Βακχιαδέων γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἤθελε γῆμαι, ἴσχει Ἠετίων ὁ Ἐχεκράτεος, δήμου μὲν ἐὼν ἐκ Πέτρης, ἀτὰρ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν Λαπίθης τε καὶ Καινείδης. ἐκ δέ οἱ ταύτης τῆς γυναικὸς οὐδ' ἐξ ἄλλης παῖδες ἐγίνοντο. ἐστάλη ὦν ἐς Δελφοὺς περὶ γόνου. ἐσιόντα δὲ αὐτὸν ἰθέως ἡ Πυθίη προσαγορεύει τοισίδε τοῖσι ἔπεσι·

Ἠετίων, οὔτις σε τίει πολύτιτον ἐόντα.
Λάβδα κύει, τέξει δ' ὀλοοίτροχον· ἐν δὲ πεσεῖται
ἀνδράσι μουνάρχοισι, δικαιώσει δὲ Κόρινθον.

---

oligarchy (*πρυτάνεις ἐκ Βακχιδῶν ἐνιαυτὸν ἄρχοντες* Pausan. *l.c.* Diodoros 7. 9 reckons only one annual *Prytanis.* Nicolas Damasc. 56, ed. Dindorf, v. 1, p. 43 might be interpreted as implying a Polemarch as well) (*c.* 747 B.C.). The Bakchiad oligarchy lasted until it was overthrown by Kypselos, ninety years after. The two hundred years *σχεδόν τι* of Strabo, 378, perhaps = ninety years + four reigns (generations), or may have come in from the *Βακχίδαι πλείους ὄντες διακοσίων*, in Diodoros *l.c.* See, further, Smith's *Dicts. Biography*, i. 450, *Geography*, i. 675, G. Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* ii. 87 ff., Busolt, *Gr. G.* i. 442 ff., i.² 631 ff.

17. **ἐδίδοσαν κτλ.** A compressed expression for *ἐξεδίδοσαν ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἤγοντο ἐξ ἀλλήλων.*

Ἀμφίων. This Amphion apparently is not mentioned elsewhere.

18. **Λάβδα.** Hardly the name her parents would have given her, if as the *Etym. Mag.* p. 199 (quoted by Stein) it was due to her deformity resembling the letter Λ. The lameness is perhaps only political afterthought or symbolism. Cp. 4. 161.

19. **ἴσχει**, has to wife. Otherwise c. 41 *supra.* Cp. 1. 94 *infra.*

20. **Ἐχεκράτεος.** Of this Echekrates nothing is known, but the name is significant.

Πέτρης. Petra is a 'deme': an expression not confined to Attica, as its primary and frequent use in the Homeric poems testifies. The place is hypothetically located in the mountainous district near Tenea, on the N. slopes of the Argive mountains south of Corinth, by Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, ii. 597, note 94.

τὰ ἀνέκαθεν, c. 65 *supra.* Pausanias 5. 18, 7 *Κυψέλῳ καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις ἐκ Τονούσσης ἦν γένος ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῆς ὑπὲρ Σικυῶνος, καὶ πρόγονός σφισιν ἦν Μέλας ὁ Ἀντάσου· Μέλανα δὲ καὶ τὸν σὺν αὐτῷ στρατὸν κατὰ τὰ προειρημένα μοι καὶ ἐν τῇ Κορινθίᾳ συγγραφῇ* (2. 4, 4) *οὐκ ἤθελεν Ἀλήτης συνοίκους δέξασθαι, γεγονός οἱ μάντευμα ἐκ Δελφῶν ὑφορώμενος, ἐς δ θεραπείᾳ τε τῇ πάσῃ χρώμενον Μέλανα καὶ ὁπότε ἀπελασθείη σὺν δεήσει ἐπανιόντα αὖθις ἐδέξατο καὶ ἄκων Ἀλήτης.*

Λαπίθης τε καὶ Καινείδης. The first a generic, the second a specific designation (Stein). Cp. *Πύλιοί τε καὶ Νηλεῖδαι* c. 65 *supra.* Aetion was evidently of the prae-Dorian population in Corinth, as were Kleisthenes and his ancestors in Sikyon, cp. c. 68 *supra.* This relation is characteristic of the Peloponnesian 'tyrants,' the tyrannis in Peloponnesos marking an anti-Dorian reaction of the conquered and subject populations. The prae-Dorian population and dynasty in Corinth passed as Aiolians (cp. Thuc. 4. 42). The Lapithae are one of the proto-Hellenic or prae-Hellenic stocks, located in Thessaly, with special relations to the Kentauri on one side and the Dorians on the other, defeating the former (cp. Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 4) and succumbing to the latter (*ib.* 2. 7). Kaineus is known to Homer, as one of the incomparable heroes of Nestor's youth, *Il.* 1. 262-272.

22. **ἐγίνοντο**, *i.e. οὔτε ἐκ ταύτης οὔτ' ἐξ ἄλλης.*

23. **ἰθέως.** As a rule the utterances of the Pythia were versified after her ecstasy, note to l. 67. Cp. 1. 47, and the case of Lykurgos 1. 65 saluted *ὡς ἐσῄιε ἐς τὸ μέγαρον*, and *contra* 6. 19.

24. **τίει πολύτιτον** contain a play upon the word *Ἠετίων* (Stein). Cp. c. 67 *supra* and *αἰετὸς infra.*

25. **ὀλοοίτροχον** = *ὀλοίτροχον*, 8. 52.

26. **ἀνδράσι μουνάρχοισι** = *ὀλιγαρχίῃ supra, ἐγγυτάτω δὲ τυράννου δυναστεία ὀλίγων ἀνδρῶν* contrasted with *ὀλιγαρχία*

ταῦτα χρησθέντα τῷ Ἠετίωνι ἐξαγγέλλεταί κως τοῖσι Βακχιάδῃσι, τοῖσι τὸ μὲν πρότερον γενόμενον χρηστήριον ἐς Κόρινθον ἦν ἄσημον, φέρον τε ἐς τὠυτὸ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἠετίωνος καὶ λέγον ὧδε·

αἰετὸς ἐν πέτρῃσι κύει, τέξει δὲ λέοντα
καρτερὸν ὠμηστήν· πολλῶν δ' ὑπὸ γούνατα λύσει.
ταῦτά νυν εὖ φράζεσθε, Κορίνθιοι, οἳ περὶ καλὴν
Πειρήνην οἰκεῖτε καὶ ὀφρυόεντα Κόρινθον.

γ) τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τοῖσι Βακχιάδῃσι πρότερον γενόμενον ἦν ἀτέκμαρτον· τότε δὲ τὸ Ἠετίωνι γενόμενον ὡς ἐπύθοντο, αὐτίκα καὶ τὸ πρότερον συνῆκαν ἐὸν συνῳδὸν τῷ Ἠετίωνος. συνέντες δὲ καὶ τοῦτο εἶχον ἐν ἡσυχίῃ, ἐθέλοντες τὸν μέλλοντα Ἠετίωνι γίνεσθαι γόνον διαφθεῖραι. ὡς δ' ἔτεκε ἡ γυνὴ τάχιστα, πέμπουσι σφέων αὐτῶν δέκα ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐν τῷ κατοίκητο ὁ Ἠετίων ἀποκτενέοντας τὸ παιδίον. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ οὗτοι ἐς τὴν Πέτρην καὶ παρελθόντες ἐς τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν Ἠετίωνος αἴτεον τὸ παιδίον· ἡ δὲ Λάβδα εἰδυῖά τε οὐδὲν τῶν εἵνεκα ἐκεῖνοι ἀπικοίατο, καὶ δοκέουσά σφεας φιλοφροσύνης τοῦ πατρὸς εἵνεκα αἰτέειν, φέρουσα ἐνεχείρισε αὐτῶν ἑνί. τοῖσι δὲ ἄρα ἐβεβούλευτο κατ' ὁδὸν τὸν πρῶτον αὐτῶν λαβόντα τὸ παιδίον προσουδίσαι. ἐπεὶ ὦν ἔδωκε φέρουσα ἡ Λάβδα, τὸν λαβόντα τῶν ἀνδρῶν θείῃ τύχῃ προσεγέλασε τὸ παιδίον, καὶ τὸν φρασθέντα τοῦτο οἶκτός τις ἴσχει ἀποκτεῖναι, κατοικτείρας δὲ παραδιδοῖ τῷ δευτέρῳ, ὁ δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ. οὕτω δὴ διεξῆλθε διὰ πάντων τῶν δέκα παραδιδόμενον, οὐδενὸς βουλομένου διεργάσασθαι. ἀποδόντες ὦν ὀπίσω τῇ τεκούσῃ τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἔξω, ἑστεῶτες ἐπὶ τῶν θυρέων ἀλλήλων ἅπτοντο καταιτιώμενοι, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ πρώτου λαβόντος, ὅτι οὐκ ἐποίησε κατὰ τὰ δεδογμένα, ἐς ὃ δή σφι χρόνου ἐγγινομένου
δ) ἔδοξε αὖτις παρελθόντας πάντας τοῦ φόνου μετίσχειν. ἔδει δὲ ἐκ

ἰσόνομος by the Theban speaker, Thuc. 3. 62.

δικαιώσει Stein takes = *κολάσει* and cps. 1. 100 *ἐδικαίευ*, but the applied justice varies with the case. The story in Nicolas *l. c. supra* represents Kypselos as specially mild in his administration of judgment (as Polemarch).

30. **αἰετὸς ἐν πέτρῃσι** = *Ἠετίων ἐκ Πέτρης*.

33. **Πειρήνην.** The much-celebrated well-head of Corinth: reputed to rise upon the Akrokorinthos (where there is a well to this day): cp. *Dict. Geogr.* i. 680.

ὀφρυόεντα. 'Embrowed' by the Akrokorinthos and itself situate on "a broad level rock nearly 200 feet in height above the plain" *op. c.* p. 679. Cp. Strabo, 382.

§ γ l. 39. **τὸν δῆμον.** Petra: see above.

46. **θείῃ τύχῃ.** Cp. *θ. πομπῇ* 4. 152.

47. **ἴσχει ἀποκτεῖναι.** Might be *ἴσχει μὴ ἀποκτεῖναι* cp. 1. 159, but the omission of the negative is more abrupt and forcible: cp. *ἴσχει κωτίλλειν*, Theognis, 816. See Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, §§ 807 ff. *ed. maj.*

§ δ l. 54. **ἔδει.** Cp. c. 33 *supra* (*καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἔδεε τούτῳ τῷ στόλῳ Ναξίους ἀπολέσθαι*—where, by the way, the position of the *γὰρ* may be contrasted with its position here *ἡ Λ. γὰρ*) and Introduction, p. cxii.

τοῦ Ἠετίωνος γόνου Κορίνθῳ κακὰ ἀναβλαστεῖν. ἡ Λάβδα γὰρ πάντα ταῦτα ἤκουε ἑστεῶσα πρὸς αὐτῇσι τῇσι θύρῃσι· δείσασα δὲ μή σφι μεταδόξῃ καὶ τὸ δεύτερον λαβόντες τὸ παιδίον ἀποκτείνωσι, φέρουσα κατακρύπτει ἐς τὸ ἀφραστότατόν οἱ ἐφαίνετο εἶναι, ἐς κυψέλην, ἐπισταμένη ὡς εἰ ὑποστρέψαντες ἐς ζήτησιν ἀπικνεοίατο πάντα ἐρευνήσειν μέλλοιεν· τὰ δὴ καὶ ἐγίνετο. ἐλθοῦσι δὲ καὶ διζημένοισι αὐτοῖσι ὡς οὐκ ἐφαίνετο, ἐδόκεε ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι καὶ λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποπέμψαντας ὡς πάντα ποιήσειαν τὰ ἐκεῖνοι ἐνετείλαντο. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἀπελθόντες ἔλεγον ε)
ταῦτα. Ἠετίωνι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ παῖς ηὐξάνετο, καί οἱ διαφυγόντι τοῦτον τὸν κίνδυνον ἀπὸ τῆς κυψέλης ἐπωνυμίην Κύψελος οὔνομα ἐτέθη. ἀνδρωθέντι δὲ καὶ μαντευομένῳ Κυψέλῳ ἐγένετο ἀμφιδέξιον χρηστήριον ἐν Δελφοῖσι, τῷ πίσυνος γενόμενος ἐπεχείρησέ τε καὶ ἔσχε Κόρινθον. ὁ δὲ χρησμὸς ὅδε ἦν·

ὄλβιος οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμὸν δόμον ἐσκαταβαίνει,
Κύψελος Ἠετίδης, βασιλεὺς κλειτοῖο Κορίνθου
αὐτὸς καὶ παῖδες, παίδων γε μὲν οὐκέτι παῖδες.

τὸ μὲν δὴ χρηστήριον τοῦτο ἦν, τυραννεύσας δὲ ὁ Κύψελος τοιοῦτος δή τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο· πολλοὺς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε,

---

59. **κυψέλην.** Cp. Pausan. 5. 17, 5 *τῆς μὲν δὴ σωτηρίας ἕνεκα τοῦ Κυψέλου τὸ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γένος οἱ ὀνομαζόμενοι Κυψελίδαι τὴν λάρνακα ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ἀνέθεσαν. τὰς δὲ λάρνακας οἱ τότε ἐκάλουν Κορίνθιοι κυψέλας· ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ καὶ ὄνομα Κύψελον τῷ παιδὶ θέσθαι λέγουσι.* Pausanias proceeds to describe the cedarn Ark of Kypselos, which he saw (as Dio Chrys. afterwards *Or.* 11. 45) with its wonderful carving. Cp. K. O. Müller, *Anc. Art*, (E. T.), p. 29, Overbeck, *Gesch. d. gr. Plastik*, i.[4] 64 ff. The work at Olympia has now been brought down to the beginning of the sixth century, and if rightly so can have had nothing to say to Kypselos or the Kypselids. Still Hdt. may have seen it, and heard the story he tells in connexion with it, possibly *en route* for Sicily (cp. 4. 29, 30, 195. Introduction, p. xcv.). The story in Nic. Damasc. 56 explains the connexion with Olympia; Aetion conveys the child to Olympia for safety. There was a statue of Zeus at Olympia connected with the family, cp. Pausan. 5. 2, 3, Suidas, *sub v.* *Κυψελιδῶν ἀνάθημα.* Mr. H. Stuart Jones' Essay, *J. H. S.* xiv. 30 ff. (1894), has antiquated previous reconstructions of the chest.

§ ε l. 67. **ἀμφιδέξιον**, 'doubly propitious.' The oracle is neither ambiguous nor double-edged, save, perhaps, in the last line (which looks like a later addition), and like that to 'Eetion' above, may be conceived as spontaneously and immediately uttered (*ἐσκαταβαίνει*). Kypselos was a *persona grata* at Delphi, 1. 14.

71. **αὐτὸς καὶ παῖδες κτλ.** A chronological particularity which raises a suspicion of a prophecy *post eventum*. Cp. 4. 163. Delphi was propitious to tyrants in their day, cp. c. 67 *supra*.

72. **τυραννεύσας**, 'became tyrant,' Madvig, *Syntax*, § 111 d, Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 19. The omitted details are supplied by Nic. Damasc. 56. Kypselos made himself popular as Polemarch, conspired against Patrokleides the king, slew him, and was made king by the people in his room. The account has a suspiciously Attic tone.

73. **τοιοῦτός τις.** The conventional picture of the 'Tyrant,' cp. 3. 80. No doubt the oligarchy suffered, but according to the tradition in Aelian, *V. H.* 1. 19 they deserved it, *διὰ τὴν τρυφὴν τὴν ἔξω τοῦ μέτρου.* The exiles found refuge at Sparta, Plutarch, *Lysand.* 1. and ultimately perhaps colonised Korkyra, Nic.

πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε, πολλῷ δέ τι πλείστους τῆς
ζ) ψυχῆς. ἄρξαντος δὲ τούτου ἐπὶ τριήκοντα ἔτεα καὶ διαπλέξαντος τὸν βίον εὖ, διάδοχός οἱ τῆς τυραννίδος ὁ παῖς Περίανδρος γίνεται. ὁ τοίνυν Περίανδρος κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἦν ἠπιώτερος τοῦ πατρός, ἐπείτε δὲ ὡμίλησε δι' ἀγγέλων Θρασυβούλῳ τῷ Μιλήτου τυράννῳ, πολλῷ ἔτι ἐγένετο Κυψέλου μιαιφονώτερος. πέμψας γὰρ παρὰ Θρασύβουλον κήρυκα ἐπυνθάνετο ὅντινα ἂν τρόπον ἀσφαλέστατον καταστησάμενος τῶν πρηγμάτων κάλλιστα τὴν πόλιν ἐπιτροπεύοι. Θρασύβουλος δὲ τὸν ἐλθόντα παρὰ τοῦ Περιάνδρου ἐξῆγε ἔξω τοῦ ἄστεος, ἐσβὰς δὲ ἐς ἄρουραν ἐσπαρμένην ἅμα τε διεξήιε τὸ λήιον ἐπειρωτῶν τε καὶ ἀναποδίζων τὸν κήρυκα κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Κορίνθου ἄπιξιν, καὶ ἐκόλουε αἰεὶ ὅκως τινὰ ἴδοι τῶν ἀσταχύων ὑπερέχοντα, κολούων δὲ ἔρριπτε, ἐς ὃ τοῦ ληίου τὸ κάλλιστόν τε καὶ βαθύτατον διέφθειρε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ· διεξελθὼν δὲ τὸ χωρίον καὶ ὑποθέμενος ἔπος οὐδὲν ἀποπέμπει τὸν κήρυκα. νοστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ κήρυκος ἐς τὴν Κόρινθον ἦν πρόθυμος πυνθάνεσθαι τὴν ὑποθήκην ὁ Περίανδρος· ὁ δὲ οὐδέν οἱ ἔφη Θρασύβουλον ὑποθέσθαι, θωμάζειν τε αὐτοῦ παρ' οἷόν μιν ἄνδρα ἀποπέμψειε, ὡς παραπλῆγά τε καὶ τῶν ἑωυτοῦ σινάμωρον, ἀπηγεόμενος τά περ πρὸς Θρασυβούλου
η) ὀπώπεε. Περίανδρος δὲ συνιεὶς τὸ ποιηθὲν καὶ νόῳ ἴσχων ὥς οἱ ὑπετίθετο Θρασύβουλος τοὺς ὑπειρόχους τῶν ἀστῶν φονεύειν, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ πᾶσαν κακότητα ἐξέφαινε ἐς τοὺς πολιήτας. ὅσα γὰρ

Damasc. 56. What Hdt. here reports as a long persecution may be the original 'extermination' of the Bakchiads. Polyainos 6. 31 explains how that was managed: but the ruse there mentioned could only have applied to a few.

§ ζ l. 75. **ἔτεα.** Thirty years. The same chronological statement is found in Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 12, 3, 1315b (after Ephoros?). During his long reign the tradition preserved by Ephoros (*apud* Nic. Damasc.) represents him as a wise and popular ruler, specially concerned in colonisation (Leukas, Anactorion, Ambrakia). Cp. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien*, pp. 71 ff., Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.² 641 ff. The conventional date is 655-625 B.C. calculated back from Periandros. See Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* i. 208. Busolt, *op. c.* p. 638, regards 657 B.C. as now established for the accession of Kypselos; 586-5 B.C. for the death of Periandros.

78. **Θρασυβούλῳ.** Thrasybulos, despot of Miletos, seems to have asserted the independence of that city in a long struggle against the encroachments of the Lydian power. His action in this matter was supported by Periandros, who was on good terms with Delphi, and perhaps instrumental in obtaining the intervention of Delphi on behalf of the Asiatic Greeks in their struggle with Lydia: 1. 19, 20.

79. **πέμψας.** The anecdote which here follows incorporates the popular and perfectly true observation that the tyranny and the oligarchy were essentially hostile forms and principles. It is not the Many but the Few who object to a 'one-man' power. As Periandros was a Sage (Diog. L. 1. 24, cp. *Pol.* 8. 11, 4, 5, 1313ab and the maxims Hdt. puts into the daughter's mouth 3. 53) Aristot. reverses the parts of the two despots, *Pol.* 8. 10, 13, 1311a. The story reappears in the romance of Roman history, Livy 1. 54.

§ η l. 96. **τοὺς πολιήτας.** It would only have been against *τοὺς ὑπειρόχους*. Either the oligarchic speaker, addressing the Spartans, takes no account of the

Κύψελος ἀπέλιπε κτείνων τε καὶ διώκων, Περίανδρός σφεα ἀπετέλεσε, μιῇ δὲ ἡμέρῃ ἀπέδυσε πάσας τὰς Κορινθίων γυναῖκας διὰ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ γυναῖκα Μέλισσαν. πέμψαντι γάρ οἱ ἐς Θεσπρωτοὺς ἐπ' Ἀχέροντα ποταμὸν ἀγγέλους ἐπὶ τὸ νεκυομαντήιον παρακαταθήκης πέρι ξεινικῆς οὔτε σημανέειν ἔφη ἡ Μέλισσα ἐπιφανεῖσα οὔτε κατερέειν ἐν τῷ κέεται χώρῳ ἡ παρακαταθήκη· ῥιγοῦν τε γὰρ καὶ εἶναι γυμνή· τῶν γάρ οἱ συγκατέθαψε ἱματίων ὄφελος εἶναι οὐδὲν οὐ κατακαυθέντων· μαρτύριον δέ οἱ εἶναι ὡς ἀληθέα ταῦτα λέγει, ὅτι ἐπὶ ψυχρὸν τὸν ἰπνὸν Περίανδρος τοὺς ἄρτους ἐπέβαλε. ταῦτα δὲ ὡς ὀπίσω ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Περιάνδρῳ, πιστὸν γάρ οἱ ἦν τὸ συμβόλαιον ὃς νεκρῷ ἐούσῃ Μελίσσῃ ἐμίγη, ἰθέως δὴ μετὰ τὴν ἀγγελίην κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον ἐξιέναι πάσας τὰς Κορινθίων γυναῖκας. αἱ μὲν δὴ ὡς ἐς ὁρτὴν ἤισαν κόσμῳ τῷ καλλίστῳ χρεώμεναι, ὁ δ' ὑποστήσας τοὺς δορυφόρους ἀπέδυσέ σφεας πάσας ὁμοίως, τάς τε ἐλευθέρας καὶ

Many, with whom the anti-Dorian tyrants were probably popular enough: or, as is more probable, Herodotus has not fully rationalised the situation. Historically, perhaps, Periandros had to contend with a Dorian reaction, which had gathered force under the mild reign of his father, and was encouraged from Sparta.

ὅσα. Acts of slaughter and expulsion.

98. **ἀπέδυσε**, 'stripped.' On Corinthian attire cp. c. 88 *supra*, and next note.

99. **Μέλισσαν.** Daughter of Prokles, tyrant of Epidauros. According to the story in 3. 50 Periandros himself killed her—possibly by accident. Her real name was Lyside: Melissa was her husband's name for her, Diog. L. *l.c.* Athenaios, 589, quotes Pythainetos of Aigina as follows: *Περίανδρον τὴν Προκλέους θυγατέρα Μέλισσαν ἰδόντα Πελοποννησιακῶς ἠσθεμένην (ἀναμπέχονος γὰρ καὶ μονοχίτων ἦν καὶ ᾠνοχόει τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις) ἐρασθέντα γῆμαι.* This tradition may have been mixed or muddled into the *ῥιγοῦν τε γὰρ καὶ εἶναι γυμνή* (*sic*): which however is good Animism. See below. The performance here narrated, if historical, is presumably an act of atonement for the crime (*κακὸν κακῷ ἰῆσθαι* was a way with that family! 3. 53).

πέμψαντι κτλ. The necromantic anecdote, which follows, has a high value, independent of the question of its literal truth or historic character, as an illustration of one side of Greek belief and ritual. The Anthropologist will see in it a consistent illustration of primitive beliefs: what our modern psychological researchers may like to see in it, be it left to the S.P.R. to determine. That Periandros practised necromancy is not in itself incredible; but the story here is discredited by its obviously designed tendency to damn the tyrant's memory.

Θεσπρωτούς. A religious centre, 2. 56, geographically defined, 8. 47, and still more exactly, Thuc. 1. 46. Corinth under Periandros had no doubt a political and commercial hold in the Adriatic, and on the neighbouring mainland: cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 334. Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 4, 9, 1304^a and 8. 10, 16, 1311^a mentions a Periandros, despot of Ambrakia, perhaps a relative of his Corinthian namesake. Cp. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien*, p. 79 (1887).

100. **παρακαταθήκης.** This *motif*, essential in the story of Glaukos 6. 86, is rather threadbare here. If Periandros really had murdered Melissa one may imagine he would have something else to say to her ghost than to 'inquire about a deposit.'

103. **ἱματίων.** Out-of-door garments, cp. c. 87 *supra*.

107. **ὃς νεκρῷ.** This filth came perhaps from Egypt (cp. 2. 89) and was good enough to fling on the dead tyrant.

108. **τὸ Ἥραιον.** Presumably the shrine of Here Bunaia, Pausan. 2. 4, 7, situate apparently on the way up the Akrokorinthos.

τὰς ἀμφιπόλους, συμφορήσας δὲ ἐς ὄρυγμα Μελίσσῃ ἐπευχόμενος κατέκαιε. ταῦτα δέ οἱ ποιήσαντι καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πέμψαντι ἔφρασε τὸ εἴδωλον τὸ Μελίσσης ἐς τὸν κατέθηκε χῶρον τοῦ ξείνου τὴν παρακαταθήκην. τοιοῦτο μὲν ὑμῖν ἐστι ἡ τυραννίς, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ τοιούτων ἔργων. ἡμέας δὲ τοὺς Κορινθίους τότε αὐτίκα θῶμα μέγα εἶχε ὅτε ὑμέας εἴδομεν μεταπεμπομένους Ἱππίην, νῦν τε δὴ καὶ μεζόνως θωμάζομεν λέγοντας ταῦτα, ἐπιμαρτυρόμεθά τε ἐπικαλεόμενοι ὑμῖν θεοὺς τοὺς Ἑλληνίους μὴ κατιστάναι τυραννίδας ἐς τὰς πόλις. οὔκων παύσεσθε ἀλλὰ πειρήσεσθε παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον κατάγοντες Ἱππίην· ἴστε ὑμῖν Κορινθίους γε οὐ συναινέοντας."

93 Σωκλέης μὲν ἀπὸ Κορίνθου πρεσβεύων ἔλεξε τάδε, Ἱππίης

---

113. **κατέκαιε.** That the garments had to be burnt in order to be of use to the ghost is an idea entirely consonant with animistic beliefs. See Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 491. The suggestion that Periandros wanted to get the gold off the ladies' clothing (Blakesley and Rawlinson) misses this point, and sacrifices the unity of the story. It is of course possible that various acts of Periandros have been 'contagminated' and confused by Herodotus, or his source. The tyrant may have burnt some clothes to supply his wife's ghost with a ghostly wardrobe. He may have confiscated ornaments and clothing to enrich his own treasury. According to Diog. Laert. Periandros burnt his παλλακίδες, to appease his wife, and plundered the ladies of Corinth, *teste Ephoro*, to get gold for an *ex voto*, in honour of an Olympian victory. Diog. L. 1. p. 25. The notion of extracting gold from a funeral pyre recurs in the unworthy insinuation levelled at Cato's memory by Julius Caesar. See Plutarch, *Cat. min.* 11 *ad fin.* κοσκίνῳ τὴν τέφραν τοῦ νεκροῦ μετέβαλε καὶ διήθησε χρυσίον ζητῶν κατακεκαυμένον.

119. **θεοὺς τοὺς Ἑλληνίους.** Cp. c. 49 *supra*. Chronologically this appeal to the 'Unity of Hellas' (cp. 8. 144 θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι), is *ex hypothesi* the earlier.

120. **οὔκων κτλ.** The asyndeton is rhetorical; cp. 4. 118 *supra*.

That Sokles, or Sosikles, of Corinth addressed to the Spartans and Peloponnesian allies the speech here put into his mouth is simply incredible. It contains little to the point, and it omits nearly everything that might have been said upon such an occasion. The Corinthians, and others, are opposed to the restoration of the Peisistratidae in Athens. Their main motive, which probably was a desire to have a counterweight to Sparta, or at least to Aigina, a reluctance to see Athens pledged to Spartan policy and supremacy, could not of course be stated openly: but what has the story of the childhood of Kypselos to say to the argument? That story is calculated to excite sympathy for the hero, and is a *non sequitur* in the mouth of Sokles. Was all that follows news to Sparta? Was it to the point? It consists of two anecdotes which, though not wholly devoid of bearing on the speaker's argument, are not expressly related to it, or to each other. The inconsistency of Sparta's hostility to the tyrannis at home, and friendship to the tyrant of Athens, was a good rhetorical point, which the Spartans had already *ex hypothesi* fully discounted in their own minds, c. 91 *supra*. It might have been put much more strongly, if Sparta's own action in the suppression of the tyranny at Corinth and elsewhere had been mentioned. (Plutarch, *Mor.* 859 = *de malig. Hdt.* 21.) The argument that oligarchies would serve Sparta better than tyrannies would have required clearer statement. Viewed as a dramatic argument this speech is a failure, and an improbability: viewed as a triad of anecdotes, each good in itself, it is a miracle of logography.

93. 1. **ἀπὸ Κορίνθου.** The services of Corinth to Athens are accumulating. The Plataean award 6. 108, the desertion

δὲ αὐτὸν ἀμείβετο τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπικαλέσας θεοὺς ἐκείνῳ, ἦ μὲν Κορινθίους μάλιστα πάντων ἐπιποθήσειν Πεισιστρατίδας, ὅταν σφι ἥκωσι ἡμέραι αἱ κύριαι ἀνιᾶσθαι ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων. Ἱππίης μὲν τούτοισι ἀμείψατο οἷα τοὺς χρησμοὺς ἀτρεκέστατα ἀνδρῶν ἐξεπιστάμενος· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν συμμάχων τέως μὲν εἶχον ἐν ἡσυχίῃ σφέας αὐτούς, ἐπείτε δὲ Σωκλέος ἤκουσαν εἴπαντος ἐλευθέρως, ἅπας τις αὐτῶν φωνὴν ῥήξας αἱρέετο τοῦ Κορινθίου τὴν γνώμην, Λακεδαιμονίοισί τε ἐπεμαρτυρέοντο μὴ ποιέειν μηδὲν νεώτερον περὶ πόλιν Ἑλλάδα.

Οὕτω μὲν τοῦτο ἐπαύσθη. Ἱππίῃ δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν ἀπελαυνομένῳ 94
ἐδίδου μὲν Ἀμύντης ὁ Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς Ἀνθεμοῦντα, ἐδίδοσαν

---

at Eleusis c. 75 *supra*, the opposition on this occasion, the support against Aegina 6. 89, are all dictated by one and the same self-interest and policy. It was the action not the principles of Corinth, which underwent a sudden conversion in the light of the Themistoklean development, and remained hostile to Athens, from before the battle of Salamis (cp. 8. 59, 61, etc.) until the close of the Peloponnesian war (Xen. *Hell.* 2. 2, 19); after which the great commercial oligarchy, alarmed by the expansive ambition of Sparta, took side again with Athens, and promoted the Athenian revival (Diodoros 14. 82, Grote, Pt. II. c. lxxiv.), not without fresh danger to itself.

2. **τοὺς αὐτοὺς θεούς**, *sc.* *τοὺς Ἑλληνίους* c. 92 *supra*. The Peisistratids were specially entitled to appeal to the Twelve Gods, Thuc. 6. 54.

4. **ἡμέραι αἱ κύριαι**, 'the days divinely appointed,' not as in c. 50 *supra*. That the future conflict of interests between Corinth and Athens might have been foreseen by Hippias, even without supernatural aid, who will deny? At the same time, considering the general character of Hdt.'s sources, one is tempted to suspect here too a *vaticinium post eventum*, born probably not of the troubles which immediately preceded the Peloponnesian war, but of the quarrel which, begun in the days of Themistokles, and developing in the struggle before the Thirty Years' truce, culminated in the outbreak of political and commercial rivalry in 431 B.C. For similar oracles cp. c. 90 *supra*.

6. **ἐξεπιστάμενος**. For the supernaturalism of Hippias cp. 6. 107. Grote iii. 391 seems to put the reply of Hippias after the demonstration of the Symmachi.

8. **αἱρέετο**. It is not very clear whether there was a formal vote, or any other speech beside the Corinthian. (Cp. contr. Thuc. 1. 67, 4.) "The shout of approbation and sympathy" (Grote) may have been accepted as a sufficient indication of the opinion of the Symmachi, by the Spartans, who themselves voted *βοῇ καὶ οὐ ψήφῳ*, Thuc. 1. 87. But the appeal (*ἐπεμαρτυρέοντο*) if not the shout (*φωνή*, cp. 4. 129) might seem to imply something articulate. The political and quasi-constitutional significance of the convocation of the allies on this occasion is well described by Grote, iii. 390.

9. **ἐπεμαρτυρέοντο**. So MSS. and Editors; the sense is the same as if we read *ἐπεμαρτύροντο*. Cp. *ἐπιμαρτυρόμεθα* c. 92 l. 118 *supra*.

10. **Ἑλλάδα**, adj., cp. 6. 98 *infra*.

94. 1. **τοῦτο**. The intrigue at Sparta for the restoration of Hippias, the *πρῆγμα ἐμπόδιον ἐκ Λακεδαιμονίων ἐγειρόμενον* of c. 90 *supra*. As the movement proved abortive it is not obvious why Athens should have completely arrested hostilities against Aigina, unless Sparta made the cessation of hostilities a condition of her quiescence. But cp. Appendices VII. §§ 8, 9, VIII. § 3.

2. **ἐδίδου**, imperf., so too *ἐδίδοσαν* just below.

Ἀμύντης. See c. 17 *supra*.

Ἀνθεμοῦς. Thuc. 2. 99 mentions the place in connexion with Grestonia (*sic*), Bisaltia and (old) Macedonia: it was presumably on the coast. (Cp. Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* iii. 1069.)

δὲ Θεσσαλοὶ Ἰωλκόν. ὁ δὲ τούτων μὲν οὐδέτερα αἱρέετο, ἀνεχώρεε δὲ ὀπίσω ἐς Σίγειον, τὸ εἷλε Πεισίστρατος αἰχμῇ παρὰ Μυτιληναίων, κρατήσας δὲ αὐτοῦ κατέστησε τύραννον εἶναι παῖδα [τὸν] ἑωυτοῦ νόθον Ἡγησίστρατον, γεγονότα ἐξ Ἀργείης γυναικός, ὃς οὐκ ἀμαχητὶ εἶχε τὰ παρέλαβε παρὰ Πεισιστράτου. ἐπολέμεον γὰρ ἔκ τε Ἀχιλληίου πόλιος ὁρμώμενοι καὶ Σιγείου ἐπὶ χρόνον συχνὸν Μυτιληναῖοί τε καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἱ μὲν ἀπαιτέοντες τὴν χώρην, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὔτε συγγινωσκόμενοι ἀποδεικνύντες τε λόγῳ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Αἰολεῦσι μετεὸν τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρης ἢ οὐ καὶ σφίσι καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι, ὅσοι Ἑλλήνων συνεπρήξαντο Μενέλεῳ τὰς
95 Ἑλένης ἁρπαγάς. πολεμεόντων δέ σφεων παντοῖα καὶ ἄλλα
ἐγένετο ἐν τῇσι μάχῃσι, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Ἀλκαῖος ὁ ποιητὴς συμβολῆς

---

3. **Θεσσαλοί.** Cp. c. 63 *supra*.

Ἰωλκόν. The reputed starting-point of the Argonauts on the Pagasaean gulf: *ἐς δὲ Ἰωλκὸν . . κατέβα ναυτᾶν ἄωτος* Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 188.

οὐδέτερα. The singular is used 1. 51 (*τῶν περιρραντηρίων οὐδέτερον*).

4. **ὀπίσω**, cp. c. 91 *supra*.

5. **τὸν** *del.* Stein.

6. **Ἀργείης.** Timonassa, d. of Gorgilos. The connexion had political significance; cp. *Ἀθ. πολ.* c. 17. *νόθος* in Athenian law. Cp. Télfy, *Corp. jur. Att.* 1341 ff. But the conditions were not always rigidly enforced. Cp. 6. 130 *infra*. There is no need to suppose that Peisistratos was polygamous, 1. 60.

8. **Ἀχιλληίου**, a fort in the neighbourhood of Rhoeteum, Strabo, 600, Pliny 5. 30. On this tomb of Achilles a wreath was laid by Alexander, Arrian, *Anab.* 1. 12, cp. Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* ii. 138 *n.*

10. **ἀποδεικνύντες.** This appeal to legend as giving a title is common, cp. 9. 27, and the award of Salamis to Athens, Plutarch, *Solon*, 10. The Homeric claim is specially significant coming from Peisistratos: cp. c. 67 *supra*. It is the Heroic conquest not the subsequent occupation which is supposed to give the title.

The conquest and occupation of a stronghold in the Troad by Peisistratos was something more than a foreign investment against a rainy day: it looks like a part of a great policy which aimed at converting the Aegean into an Athenian lake, or at least an Ionian lake under Athenian lead, and runs on all fours with the kleruchy in Salamis (cp. note c. 77 *supra*), the friendship in Eretria (1. 64), the purification of Delos (1. 64), the client-monarchy in Naxos (1. 64), the founder's kinship in Miletos (c. 65 *supra*), the connexions with Thrace (1. 64); a policy carried on by his sons in the colonisation of the Chersonese (6. 39), the alliance with Lampsakos (Thuc. 6. 59), although the latter is rather traced by Thucydides to the new necessities created by the murder of Hipparchos, and the rise of the Persian power, as further shown in the next chapter *infra*. How the alliances with Argos, with Sparta, with Thessaly, were related, in time and causality, to the colonial and maritime ambitions of Peisistratid Athens, need not here be discussed. Cp. c. 62 *supra*.

12. **συνεπρήξαντο**: cp. *συνεξεπρήξαντο* 7. 169, which van Herwerden reads here too.

95. 2. **Ἀλκαῖος.** In this chapter Hdt. is guilty apparently of a considerable *anachronism*, in making Alkaios and Periandros contemporaries of Peisistratos. He has transferred an event, his authority for which may have been the poem of Alkaios, from the first war between Athens and Lesbos in the days of Periandros and Solon, about 600 B.C., to the second or renewed war, in the days of Peisistratos, at least half a century later; and he has concluded the second war, in the days of Peisistratos, or rather of his sons, by the award of Periandros, which probably closed the first. The first war in fact has disappeared altogether from Hdt.'s view, and its traditions have been utilised for the story of the second war, which is thus made to appear the only war. The case is instructive as showing the way in which the chronological perspective

γενομένης καὶ νικώντων Ἀθηναίων *αὐτὸς μὲν φεύγων ἐκφεύγει, τὰ*
δέ οἱ ὅπλα ἴσχουσι Ἀθηναῖοι, *καί σφεα ἀνεκρέμασαν πρὸς τὸ*
Ἀθήναιον *τὸ ἐν* Σιγείῳ. *ταῦτα δὲ* Ἀλκαῖος *ἐν μέλεϊ ποιήσας*
ἐπιτιθεῖ ἐς Μυτιλήνην, *ἐξαγγελλόμενος τὸ ἑωυτοῦ πάθος* Μελαν-
ίππῳ ἀνδρὶ ἑταίρῳ. Μυτιληναίους *δὲ καὶ* Ἀθηναίους *κατήλλαξε*
Περίανδρος *ὁ* Κυψέλου· *τούτῳ γὰρ διαιτητῇ ἐπετράποντο· κατ-*
ήλλαξε δὲ ὧδε, νέμεσθαι ἑκατέρους τὴν ἔχουσι. Σίγειον *μέν νυν* 96
οὕτω ἐγένετο ὑπ' Ἀθηναίοισι. Ἱππίης *δὲ ἐπείτε ἀπίκετο ἐκ τῆς*
Λακεδαίμονος *ἐς τὴν* Ἀσίην, *πᾶν χρῆμα ἐκίνεε, διαβάλλων τε τοὺς*
Ἀθηναίους *πρὸς τὸν* Ἀρταφρένεα *καὶ ποιέων ἅπαντα ὅκως αἱ*
Ἀθῆναι *γενοίατο ὑπ' ἑωυτῷ τε καὶ* Δαρείῳ. Ἱππίης *τε δὴ ταῦτα*
ἔπρησσε, καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι *πυθόμενοι ταῦτα πέμπουσι ἐς* Σάρδις

---

may be destroyed by Hdt. and in the traditions collected by him, and how unconscious he is of its disappearance. Conversely, we see in this instance that much real matter of fact may be incorporated in traditions, which in their actual but accidental form are open to suspicion and discredit. Cp. Introduction, § 18.

7. **Μυτιληναίους.** Mytilene must have been a considerable place in the sixth and seventh centuries B.C. It was a member of the Hellenion at Naukratis (2. 178), but its power was presumably weakened by the civic strife, only terminated by the *αἰσυμνησία* of Pittakos (Arist. *Pol.* 3. 14, 8 ff. 1285^{a}), *c.* 590-570 B.C. (Cp. Flach, *Gesch. der Gr. Lyrik*, pp. 465 ff.) It is more astonishing to find the Athenians attempting to colonise the Troad, before they were secure of Salamis. Flach *l.c.* regards the colony as undertaken by the Attic nobility to indemnify the People for the severity of the new (Drakontic) code. It is rather to be connected with the economic and social condition of prae-Solonian Attica, described in Ἀθ. πολ. c. 2. The award of Periandros is dated 590 B.C. (Flach). For the fragment of Alkaios see Bergk, *Poet. Lyr.* iv.[4] p. 159, and for the ruse of Pittakos, by which he overcame Phrynon, the Athenian, Polyainos, 1. 25, Suidas *s.v.* *Πιττακός*. 'The famous Sigaean inscription' illustrates relations with Athens on the one side and the Propontis (Prokonnesos) on the other. It has been very variously dated. See Hicks, *Manual* (1882), No. 7. Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy* (1887), No. 42, and pp. 334 ff., follows Kirchhoff (*Stud. Gr. Alph.*[4]) in assigning it to the first quarter or first decade of the sixth century B.C. U. Koehler had put it back into the seventh century B.C. (*Mittheilungen*, ix. (1884), pp. 121 ff.). In any case the inscription may safely be associated with the first Athenian occupation of Sigeion. But cp. note, 6. 121 *infra*.

8. **ὁ Κυψέλου.** Hdt. would hardly have given the patronymic spontaneously here, after c. 92. He found it in his sources, or the passages did not originally run as at present. That Athenians and Lesbians should refer their differences to Periandros would ill square with the moral of that speech.

διαιτητῇ. On arbitration in such cases cp. c. 28 *supra*. The award of Periandros was in favour of Athens: this would not be viewed with any disfavour at Miletos (cp. c. 92 ζ *supra*).

96. 2. **ἐπείτε.** The date might be about 504 B.C., *i.e.* about the time of the democratic rising in Naxos, c. 30 *supra*.

6. **Σάρδις.** The Athenians had long known the way to Sardes, Solon had been there 1. 29, Alkmaion (?) had been there 6. 125 (see note *ad l.*). There had just been a previous appeal to Artaphrenes for assistance against Sparta, c. 73 *supra*, for we need not identify the embassies in this and that chapter. The application of Hippias at Sardes associated his restoration with a foreign and oriental overlordship. The 'tyrannis' was now to be in Athens, and in Greece proper, identified not so much with the rise of the conquered Hellenic or prae-Hellenic masses, as with the loss of autonomy, with sub-

ἀγγέλους, οὐκ ἐῶντες τοὺς Πέρσας πείθεσθαι Ἀθηναίων τοῖσι φυγάσι. ὁ δὲ Ἀρταφρένης ἐκέλευέ σφεας, εἰ βουλοίατο σόοι εἶναι, καταδέκεσθαι ὀπίσω Ἱππίην. οὔκων δὴ ἐνεδέκοντο τοὺς λόγους ἀποφερομένους οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι· οὐκ ἐνδεκομένοισι δέ σφι ἐδέδοκτο ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι πολεμίους εἶναι.

97 Νομίζουσι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ διαβεβλημένοισι ἐς τοὺς Πέρσας, ἐν τούτῳ δὴ τῷ καιρῷ ὁ Μιλήσιος Ἀρισταγόρης, ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου ἐξελασθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης, ἀπίκετο ἐς Ἀθήνας· αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πόλις τῶν λοιπέων ἐδυνάστευε μέγιστον. ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δῆμον ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ταὐτὰ ἔλεγε τὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ περὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ καὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ Περσικοῦ, ὡς οὔτε ἀσπίδα οὔτε δόρυ νομίζουσι εὐπετέες τε χειρωθῆναι εἴησαν. ταῦτά τε δὴ ἔλεγε καὶ πρὸς τοῖσι τάδε, ὡς οἱ Μιλήσιοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰσὶ ἄποικοι, καὶ οἰκός σφεας εἴη ῥύεσθαι δυναμένους μέγα· καὶ οὐδὲν ὅ τι οὐκ ὑπίσχετο οἷα κάρτα δεόμενος, ἐς ὃ ἀνέπεισέ σφεας. πολλοὺς γὰρ οἶκε εἶναι εὐπετέστερον διαβάλλειν

---

jection to the Mede, the Barbarian. Against such a prospect not merely the old aristocratic society but the new democratic citizens rallied. The Peisistratidae, like the Ionian tyrants, had put themselves hopelessly in the wrong by 'medising.' Cp. 4. 137 *supra*.

10. **ἐδέδοκτο**. For the tense cp. *ηὔξηντο* c. 78 *supra*.

97. 1. **νομίζουσι**. The construction appears to be somewhat loosely carried on from *σφι* just before. The narrative is resumed from c. 55, or rather from c. 51 *supra*.

διαβεβλημένοισι, cp. *διαβάλλων* c. 96 *supra*.

ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ, 'at this crisis.'

3. **ἐξελασθεὶς** seems a stronger word than the occasion warrants (cp. *ἀπελαυνόμενος* c. 55, *ἀπαλλάσσετο* c. 51 *supra*), and to imply the enforcement of the *xenelasia*: cp. c. 50 *supra*. This treatment of the *Milesian* by the *Lakedaemonian* had an obvious moral.

4. **αὕτη γάρ**, cp. 1. 56.

ἐπελθών, technical term (cp. L. & S. *sub v.* I. 1. c).

5. **τὸν δῆμον**, *i.e.* the Ekklesia. He had no doubt been previously heard in the *βουλή*, *cela va sans dire*, for an Athenian.

ταὐτά. Limited to the two points next specified. It was not remembered or suggested that Aristagoras at Athens had proposed the march to Susa and the conquest of all Asia, cp. c. 49 *supra*.

6. **πολέμου**, 'warfare.' Cp. *ἥ τε μάχη αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τοιήδε κτλ.* c. 49 *supra*.

7. **νομίζουσι** like *διαβάλλειν* *infra* is a little clumsy after the opening of the chapter. Van Herwerden would bracket *ὡς . . εἴησαν* as spurious, and read *ταὐτά*.

8. **οἱ Μιλήσιοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰσὶ ἄποικοι**. Assuming the authenticity of the tradition that this statement formed one of Aristagoras' arguments at Athens, we have here the earliest definite recognition of the supposed metropolitan character of Athens. The conception, however, goes back to the time and policy of Peisistratos, and the use made of traditions for his purposes. Cp. c. 65 *supra*. That the idea was, to say the least, an exaggeration, a systematisation of more or less authentic tradition seems probable, cp. 1. 146. The Ionian city which under Peisistratos had been raised to primacy was made the mother of all the rest. Cp. the affiliation of Thera, Kyrene, Tarentum upon Dorian Sparta (4. 147 *supra*). (Solon had represented Attica as *πρεσβυτάτην γαῖαν Ἰαονίας*, *Ath. Const.* 5.)

10. **οὐδὲν ὅ τι οὐκ**, including money of course, and surely not less than the fifty talents, which he had offered Kleomenes c. 51 *supra*. Cp. c. 103 *infra*. He could not exactly bribe the Ekklesia wholesale, but he might offer to guarantee the expenses of the expedition.

11. **πολλοὺς γὰρ κτλ.** This remark

ἢ ἕνα, εἰ Κλεομένεα μὲν τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον μοῦνον οὐκ οἷός τε ἐγένετο διαβάλλειν, τρεῖς δὲ μυριάδας Ἀθηναίων ἐποίησε τοῦτο. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν δὴ ἀναπεισθέντες ἐψηφίσαντο εἴκοσι νέας ἀποστεῖλαι

---

is a glaring instance of the political *naïveté* of Hdt. He evidently regards the help given by Athens to the Ionic revolt as a colossal blunder, and the refusal of Sparta as a piece of sound policy. He does not, indeed, expressly say that the Athenians comtemplated a march to Susa, and the terms of the psephism (εἴκοσι νέας ἀποστεῖλαι βοηθοὺς Ἴωσι) rather imply the contrary. But all the same he represents the Athenians as puppets in the hands of the adroit and plausible Milesian. Yet Hdt. has himself already recorded two diplomatic passages between Sardes and Athens which plainly portended a war: cc. 73, 96 *supra*. The Milesian recognition of the metropolitan claim of Athens here explicitly made was also something not to be despised. A great opportunity was indeed offered to Athens. Her action anticipated and probably facilitated the formation of the Delian confederacy in 476 B.C. (cp. 9. 106). It was, moreover, an act of self-defence: against Hippias and against the Mede. A Themistokles would certainly have approved it. If the Athenians made a mistake it was not in supporting the Ionian movement but in afterwards deserting it. On Hdt.'s own showing the conquest of Greece was already projected (3. 134), and his whole history goes to prove that such an attempt was inevitable. Blakesley suggests that the passage is "a note from a somewhat later hand." If we are to obelise every sentence in Hdt. to which material objection may be taken, how much will be left? The remark is certainly not Athenian. It is a venture of Hdt.'s own, or perhaps a suggestion of his Spartan sources: easier to impose on thirty thousand Athenians than on one Lakedaemonian! For an ill-omened Athenian estimate of the value of 'one Lakonian cloak' cp. Plutarch, *Nikias*, c. 19 (quoted by Freeman, *Sicily*, iii. 243).

13. **διαβάλλειν**, cp. c. 50 *supra*.

τρεῖς μυριάδας Ἀθηναίων. 'Thirty thousand' is the conventional maximum for the Athenian census in Hdt.'s own day. It has generally been regarded as an exaggeration, the census for 444 B.C. being fixed—on the strength of the Scholiast to Aristoph. *Wasps* 716, quoting Philochoros—at 19,000, or rather at 14,240 (Plut. *Per.* 37). In regard, however, to this lower estimate the consideration has been overlooked, that the figure is not the total number of citizens, but the total number who applied for a corn dole, and is exclusive therefore of the first two Solonian τιμήματα at least. The one positively certain number is the 21,000 of the year 317 B.C., though even this figure looks suspiciously round. Probabilities are all in favour of a higher figure for Periklean, and indeed for Kleisthenean Athens, even though Kleisthenes did not admit "all (*sic*) the foreign inhabitants (ξένοι μέτοικοι) and enfranchised slaves of the same rank (δοῦλοι μέτοικοι) into the number of citizens" (R.). That the number 30,000 is quite conventional is shown by such passages as Aristoph. *Ekkles.* 1132 (where it might include the women); Plato, *Sympos.* 3, of the audience in the theatre; Hdt. 8. 65, of the Eleusinian procession, which was not confined to Athenian citizens. Stein traces the figure to a confusion between the number of Athenian citizens (*circa* 20,000) and the number of Athenian soldiers (citizens + 10,000 metics) on the strength of Thuc. 2. 13. But Thuc. is there giving the real number of hoplites in 431 B.C. and an allowance must be made for those adult citizens who were not hoplites. The whole question has been most satisfactorily treated by Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Leipzig 1886, Capitel iii. Beloch regards 30,000 as roundly correct for the beginning of the century, and would augment it by 5000 to obtain the figure for 431 B.C. English readers will find the references in Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* ii.[3] p. 476, cp. also Boeckh, *Haushaltung* i.[3] pp. 44 ff. In any case that 30,000 citizens ever supported one psephisma, or even attended one meeting, is not likely. Even for a νόμος ἐπ' ἀνδρί 6000 stood conventionally for πάντες Ἀθηναῖοι. (Cp. M. Fränkel, *Die attischen Geschworenen-Gerichte*, 1877, pp. 14 ff.)

βοηθοὺς Ἴωσι, στρατηγὸν ἀποδέξαντες αὐτῶν εἶναι Μελάνθιον ἄνδρα τῶν ἀστῶν ἐόντα τὰ πάντα δόκιμον· αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι.

98 Ἀρισταγόρης δὲ προπλώσας καὶ ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὴν Μίλητον, ἐξευρὼν βούλευμα ἀπ' οὗ Ἴωσι μὲν οὐδεμία ἔμελλε ὠφελίη ἔσεσθαι, οὐδ' ὧν οὐδὲ τούτου εἵνεκα ἐποίεε ἀλλ' ὅκως βασιλέα Δαρεῖον λυπήσειε, ἔπεμψε ἐς τὴν Φρυγίην ἄνδρα ἐπὶ τοὺς Παίονας τοὺς ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ αἰχμαλώτους γενομένους ὑπὸ Μεγαβάζου, οἰκέοντας δὲ τῆς Φρυγίης χῶρόν τε καὶ κώμην ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν· ὃς ἐπειδὴ ἀπίκετο ἐς τοὺς Παίονας, ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἄνδρες Παίονες, ἔπεμψέ με Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος σωτηρίην ὑποθησόμενον ὑμῖν, ἤν περ βούλησθε πείθεσθαι. νῦν γὰρ Ἰωνίη πᾶσα ἀπέστηκε ἀπὸ βασιλέος, καὶ ὑμῖν παρέχει σώζεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ὑμετέρην αὐτῶν· μέχρι μὲν θαλάσσης αὐτοῖσι ὑμῖν, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου ἡμῖν ἤδη μελήσει." ταῦτα δὲ ἀκούσαντες οἱ Παίονες κάρτα τε ἀσπαστὸν ἐποιήσαντο καὶ ἀναλαβόντες παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ἀπεδίδρησκον ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, οἱ δέ τινες αὐτῶν καὶ κατέμειναν ἀρρωδήσαντες αὐτοῦ. ἐπείτε δὲ οἱ Παίονες ἀπίκοντο ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, ἐνθεῦτεν ἐς Χίον διέβησαν. ἐόντων δὲ ἤδη ἐν Χίῳ, κατὰ πόδας ἐληλύθεε Περσέων ἵππος πολλὴ διώκουσα τοὺς Παίονας. ὡς δὲ

---

15. **Ἴωσι.** The antithesis of Athenian to Ionian seems implied in the terms of the psephism. But Ἴωσι has here perhaps a locative force. The ascent to Sardes, in Lydia, may have lain beyond the commission to Melanthios. Cp. cc. 100, 102 *infra*.

στρατηγὸν ἀποδέξαντες. This special appointment of a single Strategos, or commander-in-chief, is of some constitutional importance, at a date when the ordinary Strategi were still probably elected by, from, and for the *Phylae*. Cp. Ἀθ. πολ. c. 22, and Appendix IX. § 13. It can hardly have been an accident that the Athenian Strategos on this service bore the name of Melanthios. A Melanthos is the father of Kodros. Cp. c. 65 *supra*, and the Ionian founders of Miletos, like the Peisistratidae themselves, were traced to the same ancestry, 1. 147.

16. **ἀρχὴ κακῶν,** 'a source of woes' (not with Grote inaccurately "the beginning of the mischiefs," iii. p. 499). In any case the phrase is an exaggeration, used with epic force to dramatise the story. Van Herwerden adopts Cobet's emendation *ἀρχέκακοι* (from Plutarch, *Mor.* 861, supported by *Iliad* 5. 62 *νῆας ἐΐσας Ἀρχεκάκους*). With the formula cp. c. 28 *supra*, 6. 67 *infra*, Thuc. 2. 12, 3.

98. 1. **Ἀρισταγόρης δὲ** answering to *Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν* just above.

2. **βούλευμα** refers not to the Athenian alliance but to the whole *ἀπόστασις*. Hdt. slightly varies his theory 6. 1 *infra*.

3. **τούτου εἵνεκα.** The motives of Aristagoras are not hidden from Hdt. They are more fully stated c. 35 *supra* from a different point of view. Cp. Introduction, p. cvi.

4. **τοὺς Παίονας,** c. 23 *supra*.

6. **ἐπ' ἑωυτῶν,** 'by themselves.' Cp. *ἐπ' ἡμέων αὐτῶν* 4. 114, and 8. 32, 9. 17, *et al.* Cp. also *ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν* c. 73 *supra*.

8. **ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος.** The messenger, or the author, has forgotten that there was now *ἰσονομίη* in Miletos, c. 37 *supra*, but cp. c. 49 *supra*.

σωτηρίη is both more and less than *ἐλευθερίη* (cp. *σώζεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ὑμετέρην αὐτῶν infra*).

οὐ κατέλαβον, ἐπηγγέλλοντο ἐς τὴν Χίον τοῖσι Παίοσι ὅκως ἂν ὀπίσω ἀπέλθοιεν. οἱ δὲ Παίονες τοὺς λόγους οὐκ ἐνεδέκοντο, ἀλλ' ἐκ Χίου μὲν Χῖοί σφεας ἐς Λέσβον ἤγαγον, Λέσβιοι δὲ ἐς Δορίσκον ἐκόμισαν, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ πεζῇ κομιζόμενοι ἀπίκοντο ἐς Παιονίην.

Ἀρισταγόρης δέ, ἐπειδὴ οἵ τε Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπίκοντο εἴκοσι νηυσί, 99
ἅμα ἀγόμενοι Ἐρετριέων πέντε τριήρεας, οἳ οὐ τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν ἐστρατεύοντο ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτῶν Μιλησίων, ὀφειλόμενά σφι ἀποδιδόντες· οἱ γὰρ δὴ Μιλήσιοι πρότερον τοῖσι Ἐρετριεῦσι τὸν πρὸς Χαλκιδέας πόλεμον συνδιήνεικαν, ὅτε περ καὶ Χαλκιδεῦσι

---

18. **ὅκως ἄν**, 'they had an order conveyed to them, to get them to return.' The grammatical distinction between *ἐπηγγέλλοντο ὅκως ἂν ἀπέλθοιεν* and *ἐποίεε ὅκως βασιλέα λυπήσειε* ('he was acting with a view to injure the king') *supra*, is observable, *ὅκως ἂν* implying a condition ('occasione data'), *ὅκως* by itself indicating the intention, pure and simple. Cp. R. Heiligenstädt, *De enuntiatorum finalium usu Herodoteo* etc., Pars prior, p. 39 (1883).

21. **Δορίσκον**. Blakesley points out that Doriskos was at this time held by a Persian garrison. Cp. 7. 59. If the fugitives were landed at Doriskos they must have been in force. Even so, it is surprising to hear nothing of any action. Is this story of the escape of the Paionians correctly dated? If they landed at Doriskos, it was probably after the revolt of the Hellespont (c. 103 *infra*). Is it genuine history? A former story of the Paionians (cc. 12, 13) is open to suspicion, and the wholesale transportation (c. 15) perhaps exaggerated. There were evidently 'Paionians' in Phrygia in Hdt.'s own day (*οἱ δέ τινες αὐτῶν καὶ κατέμειναν*), but the greater part in Europe. Hdt. here implies that the Asiatic Paionians were a colony, so to speak, from Europe. Elsewhere he preserves the tradition, or theory, that Thrace had been invaded from Asia (7. 20); a theory for which much may be said. (Cp. Giseke, *Thrakisch-Pelasgische Stämme*, pp. 2 ff.) Yet it would be rather too much to suppose that the whole story here told is simply an effort to explain the appearance of Paionians on both sides of the Aegean. Whence does Hdt. derive it? There seems no internal indication to determine between an Asiatic and a European, between oral and written sources. The story here supplies a neat literary link, and perhaps answers or anticipates a possible objection to the story of the transportation told above. Aristagoras himself afterwards ran away to Thrace, to Myrkinos on the Strymon, and met his end while besieging a Thracian town, c. 126 *infra*. His route is not there given, but Doriskos cannot have been his point of landing; and for these Paionians, who wished to gain the Strymon, to land at the Hebros seems a curious proceeding. (On the geography of Thrace, between these two rivers, cp. 7. 108-113.)

99. 1. **ἐπειδή**. Presumably in the spring (498 B.C.), cp. Appendix V. Twenty ships was no inconsiderable force for the Athens of that day, being nearly a moiety of the fleet (50 sail), and the same number as was borrowed from Corinth for the Aiginetan war, 6. 89. On the possible connexion cp. Appendix VIII. § 3.

2. **ἀγόμενοι**. The Athenian Strategos had perhaps a superior authority over the Eretrian contingent, notwithstanding the assertion of independent action (*οὐ τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν*). Eretria supplied only seven triremes to the national fleet at Artemision and at Salamis in 480 B.C. Cp. 8. 1, 46. But the town had been severely handled by the Persians in 490 B.C., 6. 101.

οὐ τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν looks almost like an express contradiction of an Athenian claim, or at least of a claim that would naturally occur to the mind at the date when Hdt. was writing. The Eretrian Strategos on this occasion was one Evalkidas, c. 102 *infra*.

4. **τὸν πρὸς Χαλκιδέας πόλεμον**. This is the only clear allusion in Hdt. to the great war between Chalkis and

ἀντία Ἐρετριέων καὶ Μιλησίων Σάμιοι ἐβοήθεον· οὗτοι ὦν ἐπείτε
σφι ἀπίκοντο καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σύμμαχοι παρῆσαν, ἐποιέετο στρατηίην
ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἐς Σάρδις. αὐτὸς μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἐστρατεύετο ἀλλ'
ἔμενε ἐν Μιλήτῳ, στρατηγοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἀπέδεξε Μιλησίων εἶναι,
τὸν ἑωυτοῦ τε ἀδελφεὸν Χαροπῖνον καὶ τῶν ἀστῶν ἄλλον Ἑρμό-
100 φαντον. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ τῷ στόλῳ τούτῳ Ἴωνες ἐς Ἔφεσον πλοῖα
μὲν κατέλιπον ἐν Κορησῷ τῆς Ἐφεσίης, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀνέβαινον χειρὶ
πολλῇ, ποιεύμενοι Ἐφεσίους ἡγεμόνας τῆς ὁδοῦ. πορευόμενοι δὲ
παρὰ ποταμὸν Καΰστριον, ἐνθεῦτεν ἐπείτε ὑπερβάντες τὸν Τμῶλον
ἀπίκοντο, αἱρέουσι Σάρδις οὐδενός σφι ἀντιωθέντος, αἱρέουσι δὲ

Eretria, with their respective allies, which according to Thucydides (1. 13) rose to Panhellenic proportions, and alone of wars deserved mention between the Trojan and the Persian. Like the Peloponnesian war it was a war of divided Hellas, nay, of divided Ionia. Eretria, Athens, Miletos and their confederates (cp. 6. 21) seem to have had the worst of it. The interests at stake were probably commercial, but the duel between the two principals was fought out with cavalry on the Lelantian plain, and the Thessalians secured victory for Chalkis. (Plutarch, *Mor.* 760, after 'Aristotle'; cp. Aristot. *Frag.* 98 ed. Teub. p. 96.) The geographical position of Chalkis, commanding the Euripos, may have contributed to the issue. The victor reaped as reward the great colonial *i.e.* commercial expansion which sowed Thrace with Chalkidic colonies, and opened Sicily and the west (Cumae) to Chalkidic enterprise. Cp. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i.² 456, E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alterthums*, ii. § 302, Freeman, *Sicily*, i. c. iv., A. Holm, *Hist. of Greece*, i. 271 f. (E. T. 1894).

7. **ἐποιέετο**, middle. He probably could not have gone in person. See *infra*. If the text can be trusted Aristagoras still acted as *τύραννος*. Cp. cc. 37, 38, 49, 98. Perhaps Charopinos and Hermophantos had been in office during the absence of Aristagoras at Sparta and Athens, cp. c. 38 *supra*. They were presumably in command of the Milesian forces, while Aristagoras remained in the city to defend it.

100. 1. **Ἴωνες**. Are the Athenians lumped with the Ionians? Or were they protecting Miletos? See c. 105 *infra*.

2. **χειρὶ πολλῇ**, a curious and vague phrase, *πολλῇ* = *μεγάλῃ*. In 1. 174 = *πλήθεϊ χερῶν*. Cp. c. 72 *supra*, 7. 157, etc.

3. **ποιεύμενοι**, 'getting men of Ephesos to show them the way.' This was about all the assistance the Ephesians gave the rebellion. Cp. 6. 16 *infra*. The route from Ephesos to Sardes went up the Kaystros, struck north across Tmolos, and went down the valley of the Paktolos. But this was the regular road from Ephesos to Sardes (c. 54 *supra*) through the Pass of Kara Bel, and 'guides' can hardly have been necessary. Hdt. himself had not been over the ground, and does not know the roads from Sardes to the coast at first hand. (Cp. W. M. Ramsay, *Hist. Geog. of Asia mi.* pp. 30, 60 ff., and Appendix XIII.)

5. **οὐδενὸς ἀντιωθέντος**. That Sardes should have been taken upon this occasion without a blow must appear very extraordinary to any one who reflects that according to Hdt.'s own showing the Persian satrap had months of warning of the rebellion, had witnessed the expulsion of the medising tyrants (c. 37), the flight of the Paionians from Phrygia (c. 98), was no doubt acquainted with the movements of Aristagoras, and had special reason to keep an eye upon him (c. 35). The *De Malignitate* 24 preserves a tradition that the Persian forces were besieging Miletos, and that the object of the attack on Sardes was to force them to raise the siege. The Ionians had begun the campaign by defeating the Persian fleet off Pamphylia. This story is rational and coherent, and cannot be dismissed with the remark of Rawlinson that "the silence of Hdt. is conclusive against these statements," as if Hdt. were writing of events with which he was contemporary, or as if

χωρὶς τῆς ἀκροπόλιος τἆλλα πάντα· τὴν δὲ ἀκρόπολιν ἐρρύετο
αὐτὸς Ἀρταφρένης ἔχων ἀνδρῶν δύναμιν οὐκ ὀλίγην. τὸ δὲ μὴ 101
λεηλατῆσαι ἑλόντας σφέας τὴν πόλιν ἔσχε τόδε. ἦσαν ἐν τῇσι Σάρδισι οἰκίαι αἱ μὲν πλεῦνες καλάμιναι, ὅσαι δ' αὐτέων καὶ πλίνθιναι ἦσαν, καλάμου εἶχον τὰς ὀροφάς· τουτέων δὴ μίαν τῶν τις στρατιωτέων ὡς ἐνέπρησε, αὐτίκα ἀπ' οἰκίης ἐπ' οἰκίην ἰὸν τὸ πῦρ ἐπενέμετο τὸ ἄστυ πᾶν. καιομένου δὲ τοῦ ἄστεος οἱ Λυδοί τε καὶ ὅσοι Περσέων ἐνῆσαν ἐν τῇ πόλι, ἀπολαμφθέντες πάντοθεν ὥστε τὰ περιέσχατα νεμομένου τοῦ πυρός, καὶ οὐκ ἔχοντες ἐξήλυσιν ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος, συνέρρεον ἔς τε τὴν ἀγορὴν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Πακτωλὸν ποταμόν, ὅς σφι ψῆγμα χρυσοῦ καταφορέων ἐκ τοῦ Τμώλου διὰ μέσης τῆς ἀγορῆς ῥέει καὶ ἔπειτα ἐς τὸν Ἕρμον ποταμὸν ἐκδιδοῖ, ὁ δὲ ἐς θάλασσαν· ἐπὶ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν Πακτωλὸν καὶ ἐς τὴν ἀγορὴν ἀθροιζόμενοι οἵ τε Λυδοὶ καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι ἠναγκάζοντο ἀμύνεσθαι. οἱ δὲ Ἴωνες ὁρέοντες τοὺς μὲν ἀμυνομένους τῶν πολεμίων τοὺς δὲ σὺν πλήθεϊ πολλῷ προσφερομένους, ἐξανεχώρησαν δείσαντες πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸν Τμῶλον καλεόμενον, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὑπὸ νύκτα ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐπὶ τὰς νέας.
Καὶ Σάρδιες μὲν ἐνεπρήσθησαν, ἐν δὲ αὐτῇσι καὶ ἱρὸν 102

---

his stories furnished a complete and critical record. If a portion of the Persian forces were before Miletos we can understand Artaphrenes retiring on the citadel. We can understand why the Ionians went to Koresos in boats (πλοῖα). We can understand the burning and evacuation of Sardes, and one or two other points in the next chapter otherwise obscure.

7. **δύναμιν οὐκ ὀλίγην.** Another vague phrase, which if true would make the conduct of Artaphrenes the more inexplicable.

101. 2. **τόδε.** The Ionians were prevented sacking Sardes by the conflagration of the lower city, which 'compelled' (ἠναγκάζοντο *infra*) the Persian garrison in the Akropolis, and the Lydians in the lower city, who were surrounded and could not escape into the country, to rally in the Agora, to turn upon the Ionian forces, and drive them away! It is pretty obvious that the facts have been 'doctored.'

5. **ὡς ἐνέπρησε.** Hdt. does not expressly say that the act was accidental. For all that appears, the soldier might have acted under orders, or might have acted of malice prepense.

6. **ἄστεος . . πόλι.** The distinction between the ἄστυ and the πόλις is clearly marked: only the former was consumed. Yet just above πόλις is used in contrast to ἀκρόπολις. There was nothing to bring the garrison down out of the Akropolis. If the fire seized first the outer ring of the city, and if the Lydians were hemmed in, that looks all the less like accident.

14. **τοὺς μὲν . . τοὺς δέ.** This passage looks like a distorted reminiscence of the probable course of events. The Persians are besieging Miletos: the Ionian fleet with the assistance of the Athenians defeat the Persian fleet off the Pamphylian coast. To raise if possible the siege of Miletos Aristagoras projects a brilliant dash on Sardes. It is successfully carried out. The Persian garrison, indeed, holds the citadel, but the town falls into the hands of the Ionians, and is fired. Meanwhile Persian forces from before Miletos advance to the rescue (σὺν πλήθεϊ πολλῷ), and the Ionians are threatened in front and rear, but make good their retreat under cover of night, not perhaps altogether empty-handed. They are, however, overtaken and routed "in Ephesos" (c. 102).

ἐπιχωρίης θεοῦ Κυβήβης· τὸ σκηπτόμενοι οἱ Πέρσαι ὕστερον ἀντενεπίμπρασαν τὰ ἐν Ἕλλησι ἱρά. τότε δὲ οἱ Πέρσαι οἱ ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ νομοὺς ἔχοντες, προπυνθανόμενοι ταῦτα, συνηλίζοντο καὶ ἐβοήθεον τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι. καί κως ἐν μὲν Σάρδισι οὐκέτι ἐόντας τοὺς Ἴωνας εὑρίσκουσι, ἑπόμενοι δὲ κατὰ στίβον αἱρέουσι αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. καὶ ἀντετάχθησαν μὲν οἱ Ἴωνες, συμβαλόντες δὲ πολλὸν ἑσσώθησαν. καὶ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν οἱ Πέρσαι φονεύουσι ἄλλους τε ὀνομαστούς, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Εὐαλκίδην στρατηγέοντα Ἐρετριέων, στεφανηφόρους τε ἀγῶνας ἀναραιρηκότα καὶ ὑπὸ Σιμωνίδεω τοῦ Κηίου πολλὰ αἰνεθέντα· οἳ δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπέφυγον τὴν μάχην, ἐσκεδάσθησαν ἀνὰ τὰς πόλιας.

---

102. 2. Κυβήβης, identified with μητὴρ Δινδυμήνη 1. 80, here treated by Hdt. (and by the Greeks who burnt her temple) as a non-Hellenic divinity. The head-quarters of the great Asiatic mother were rather in Phrygia, at Pessinus, than in Lydia, at Sardes. The identification of Kybele, or Kybebe, with Rhea may be later than Hdt. or unknown to him. The classical tract upon the ritual is Lucian's περὶ τῆς Συρίης θεοῦ, nor is it likely that the ritual was any purer or more wholesome in earlier times, though the destruction of Kybele's shrine at Sardes is scarcely to be ascribed to Greek puritanism. The Atys-myth, which was involved with the cult of the Great Mother, is virtually localised or connected with Sardes in the story told 1. 34-45.

τό. The Persians hardly required an excuse for destroying Hellenic shrines, nor did they destroy them apparently of set purpose, or wholesale. The sanctity of Delos they respected, 6. 97 *infra*, and Delphi was not plundered, much less consumed. But the destruction of the temple at Sardes was, probably, an offence to Greek consciences, and Greek ideas of right were appeased by the colourable *quid pro quo*.

4. **ἐντὸς Ἅλυος**, *i.e.* west of the Halys, cp. 1. 6.

The **νομοί** would be the first three enumerated 3. 90. But the 'Persians' here referred to were *strategi* not *satraps*, cp. c. 116 *infra*.

προπυνθανόμενοι grates upon the narrative, and implies that it has been incomplete. The Persians had not been sitting idle all the winter and spring. This indication goes to support the suggestions made above, cc. 100 f. notes.

8. **πολλὸν ἑσσώθησαν.** If the Ionians (Athenians) and Eretrians suffered 'a great defeat' on the return march from Sardes, it is a wonder that Charon of Lampsakos did not say so. His account ran: Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ εἴκοσι τριήρεσιν ἔπλευσαν ἐπικουρήσοντες τοῖς Ἴωσι καὶ εἰς Σάρδεις ἐστρατεύσαντο, καὶ εἷλον τὰ περὶ Σάρδεις ἅπαντα χωρὶς τοῦ τείχους τοῦ βασιληΐου· ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἐπαναχωροῦσιν εἰς Μίλητον, *De Malig.* 24; Müller, *F.H.G.* i. p. 33, *Frag.* 2. The burning of Sardes gave an impulse to the revolt (see next chapter) which could hardly have been the case if it had been immediately followed by a crushing defeat. Rawlinson, who suggests that the sea-fight off the Pamphylian coast, omitted by Hdt., "is probably a mere misrepresentation of the battle c. 112 *infra*," does not suggest that the great defeat at Ephesos here recorded may be an anticipation of the battle c. 116 *infra*. The death of Evalkides, which looks like hard fact, tends to fix the battle "in Ephesos" to the first campaign: but as Busolt (*Gr. G.* ii. 33) points out, the Eretrians probably did not desert the Ionian cause with the Athenians.

10. **στεφανηφόρους** here = στεφανίτας. Cp. 8. 26, Hermann, *Lehrbuch* ii.[2] § 30. 4. His crowns and poetical lauds did not save him nor celebrate him on this occasion: the verses in question were *Epinikia* not *Epitaphia*. On Simonides of Keos (B.C. 566-469) see Mahaffy, *Gr. Lit.*[2] Poets § 148, Bergk, *Poet. Lyr. Gr.* iii.[4] pp. 382-535 (where this passage appears as No. 9), Flach, *Gr. Lyrik*, pp. 611-646. Hdt. elsewhere, 7. 228, quotes Simonides, and gives his patronymic

Τότε μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἠγωνίσαντο. μετὰ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν τὸ 103
παράπαν ἀπολιπόντες τοὺς Ἴωνας, ἐπικαλεομένου σφέας πολλὰ δι' ἀγγέλων Ἀρισταγόρεω, οὐκ ἔφασαν τιμωρήσειν σφι· Ἴωνες δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίης στερηθέντες, οὕτω γάρ σφι ὑπῆρχε πεποιημένα ἐς Δαρεῖον, οὐδὲν δὴ ἧσσον τὸν πρὸς βασιλέα πόλεμον ἐσκευάζοντο. πλώσαντες δὲ ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον Βυζάντιόν

('son of Leoprepes'), not as here, his birthplace. Keos was the nearest of the Kyklades to Attica.

103. 1. τὸ παράπαν ἀπολιπόντες τοὺς Ἴωνας. Grote (Pt. II. c. xxxv. vol. iii. p. 501) gratuitously conjectures "some glaring desertion on the part of their Asiatic allies" to account for this apparently feeble and inconsequent act on the part of the Athenians. The only glaring desertion recorded is this very act of the Athenians themselves. Of course there was a sufficient reason, positive or negative, though Hdt. has recorded none. It may be conjectured that the question for the Athenians was not one of staying in Ionia or going home, but of staying at home, or returning, next year, to Ionia. The Athenians hardly sent out their ships with a permanent or unlimited commission. The ships would return to Athens at the end of the season. Something had been accomplished: the Persian fleet defeated, the siege of Miletos raised, Sardes destroyed; the revolt in Asia was in full swing; the Athenians might feel themselves safe for the present from the machinations of Hippias and Artaphrenes, and turned a deaf ear to the solicitations of Aristagoras, during the winter and ensuing spring (*ἐπικαλεομένου σφέας πολλὰ δι' ἀγγέλων*). Perhaps the promises of Aristagoras, including the 50 talents or so (cp. c. 97 *supra*), had not been fulfilled. This change of policy was perhaps shortsighted, and selfish; but the twenty ships had not been commissioned in the first instance from motives of heroic altruism or ambition. It should be considered further that there may have been very good excuses in the foreign relations of Athens west of the Aegean, and in the state of parties in the city itself, for keeping the twenty vessels and their crews at home. Twenty ships could not be engaged permanently on distant service, with Aigina on one side and Chalkis on the other, each looking out for Athenian troubles: and there was probably now, as later, a party in the city itself prepared to suck advantage from any fiasco abroad, or straining of the state's resources. It is not to be supposed that Aristagoras, who went into the business a bankrupt c. 35 *supra*, defrayed the expenses. The ships had accomplished their mission. That the Athenians would have been well advised to have supported the revolt again at a later stage is not to be denied. They themselves, when too late, seem to have taken this view of the matter. See 6. 21 *infra*. There was current a similar criticism upon the policy of the Spartans, cp. c. 50 *supra*, Thuc. 1. 69, 9. See further, Appendices VII. VIII.

6. **πλώσαντες.** This word may mark the beginning of the second year of the war, and it would be difficult to rationalise the Ionian movement except upon the supposition that there was no immediate danger of an advance of the king's fleet, owing to the great victory in the previous summer, off the Pamphylian coast. Cp. c. 102 *supra*, and Appendix V.

Ἑλλήσποντον. Here used inclusively of the whole water-way, Hellespont, Propontis and Bosporos. It might be suspected that the towns on the Hellespont proper had joined the revolt earlier, but that Byzantion, Chalkedon, and the towns about them, only joined on the appearance of the Ionian fleet in the second year of the war; cp. c. 117 *infra*.

A regular and necessary preliminary to the liberation of the Hellespont was an Hellenic victory in the Southern Levant; otherwise Ionia was at the mercy of the king's ships. So the prize of Mykale is the Hellespont 9. 101 *ad fin.* So Pausanias heads for Kypros before blockading Byzantion in 478-7 B.C., Thuc. 1. 94, and the same strategy is pursued by Kimon and the Athenians, again and again. Kypros was now, indeed, in revolt, but that revolt itself is best explained by the

τε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πόλιας πάσας τὰς ταύτῃ ὑπ' ἑωυτοῖσι ἐποιήσαντο, ἐκπλώσαντές τε ἔξω τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον Καρίης τὴν πολλὴν προσεκτήσαντο σφίσι σύμμαχον εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ τὴν Καῦνον πρότερον οὐ βουλομένην συμμαχέειν, ὡς ἐνέπρησαν τὰς Σάρδις,
104 τότε σφι καὶ αὕτη προσεγένετο. Κύπριοι δὲ ἐθελονταί σφι πάντες προσεγένοντο πλὴν Ἀμαθουσίων· ἀπέστησαν γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι ὧδε ἀπὸ Μήδων. ἦν Ὀνήσιλος Γόργου μὲν τοῦ Σαλαμινίων βασιλέος ἀδελφεὸς νεώτερος, Χέρσιος δὲ τοῦ Σιρώμου τοῦ Εὐέλθοντος παῖς. οὗτος ὡνὴρ πολλάκις μὲν καὶ πρότερον τὸν Γόργον παρηγορέετο ἀπίστασθαι ἀπὸ βασιλέος, τότε δέ, ὡς καὶ τοὺς Ἴωνας ἐπύθετο ἀπεστάναι, πάγχυ ἐπικείμενος ἐνῆγε· ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθε τὸν Γόργον, ἐνθαῦτά μιν φυλάξας ἐξελθόντα τὸ ἄστυ τὸ Σαλαμινίων ὁ Ὀνήσιλος ἅμα τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ στασιώτῃσι ἀπεκλήισε τῶν πυλέων. Γόργος μὲν δὴ στερηθεὶς τῆς πόλιος ἔφευγε ἐς Μήδους, Ὀνήσιλος δὲ ἦρχε Σαλαμῖνος καὶ ἀνέπειθε πάντας Κυπρίους συναπίστασθαι. τοὺς μὲν δὴ ἄλλους ἀνέπεισε, Ἀμα-

---

supposition of the naval victory omitted by Hdt. See next chapter.

Βυζάντιον. The area of revolt extends now from Kypros all round the coast to Byzantion, for Kypros had probably been won by the victory off Pamphylia a year before. The burning of Sardes added Karia to the cause: the siege of Miletos was apparently raised: and the first campaign of the new year effects the liberation of the Hellespont and Bosporos.

8. **ἔξω**, with accus. 7. 58. The harsh construction is here softened by *ἐκπλώσαντες* which suggests *ἐκπλέων* there.

9. **Καῦνον.** The Kaunians were hardly Hellenes; see 1. 172.

11. **τότε.** Hdt.'s chronology and causality here are anything but clear, for if Kaunos joined (1) after the rest of Karia, (2) in consequence of the burning of Sardes, then Karia would seem to have joined from the first. But (1) Karia joins after the 'Hellespont' and Byzantion, (2) the news reaches Daurises in his campaign on the Hellespont, c. 117 *infra*.

104. 2. **ἀπέστησαν.** The Kypriotes had presumably declared their independence after the first naval battle (cp. c. 100 *supra*): otherwise, a disaster at Ephesos, and the Athenian desertion, were hardly good reasons for joining now. There were in Kypros nine city-states, under royal government. Diodor. 16. 42, 4 though describing the condition about 351 B.C. may be taken to illustrate the time of the Ionian revolt. B. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 620, enumerates the kingdoms: Salamis, Citium, Marium, Amathus, Curium, Paphos, Soli, Lapethos, Ceryneia. Of these only Salamis, Kurion, Soli on the one hand, and Amathus on the other, appear in Hdt.'s narrative. Evelthon, who was known at Delphi, was king of Kyprian Salamis whenas Pheretime fled from Kyrene the first time. See 4. 162 *supra*. His great-grandson, Onesilos, is now king: the succession seems rapid. It is not, however, actually said that all four generations sat on the throne. Siromis or Chersis may have dropped out. Amathus (Hamath) was perhaps the head-quarters of the Phoenician interest, as Salamis of the Hellenic.

καὶ οὗτοι, *sc.* οἱ Κύπριοι.

6. **ὡς . . ἐπύθετο.** The news would have reached Kypros surely before the voyage to Byzantion: perhaps, indeed, before the return of Aristagoras to Ionia. The information was probably sent, and the co-operation of the Kypriotes invited, c. 38 *supra*. Was the **ἄστυ** enclosed with a wall, or were the **πύλαι** mentioned those of the **πόλις**?

11. **ἀνέπειθε . . ἀνέπεισε,** the tenses used with strict meaning.

θουσίους δὲ οὐ βουλομένους οἱ πείθεσθαι ἐπολιόρκεε προσκατήμενος.

105 *Ὀνήσιλος μέν νυν ἐπολιόρκεε Ἀμαθοῦντα. βασιλέι δὲ Δαρείῳ ὡς ἐξαγγέλθη Σάρδις ἁλούσας ἐμπεπρῆσθαι ὑπό τε Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἰώνων, τὸν δὲ ἡγεμόνα γενέσθαι τῆς συλλογῆς ὥστε ταῦτα συνυφανθῆναι τὸν Μιλήσιον Ἀρισταγόρην, πρῶτα μὲν λέγεται αὐτόν, ὡς ἐπύθετο ταῦτα, Ἰώνων οὐδένα λόγον ποιησάμενον, εὖ εἰδότα ὡς οὗτοί γε οὐ καταπροΐξονται ἀποστάντες, εἰρέσθαι οἵτινες εἶεν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, μετὰ δὲ πυθόμενον αἰτῆσαι τὸ τόξον, λαβόντα δὲ καὶ ἐπιθέντα δὲ ὀιστὸν ἄνω πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀπεῖναι, καί μιν ἐς τὸν ἠέρα βάλλοντα εἰπεῖν "ὦ Ζεῦ, ἐκγενέσθαι μοι Ἀθηναίους τίσασθαι," εἴπαντα δὲ ταῦτα προστάξαι ἑνὶ τῶν θεραπόντων δείπνου προκειμένου αὐτῷ ἐς τρὶς ἑκάστοτε*

---

105. 2. **ὡς κτλ.** The fact would have been known in Susa before the end of the first year, for it would not take the king's messengers long to bear the news: cp. 8. 98 (the Royal Post).

3. **Ἀθηναίων.** This is the first clear indication in Hdt.'s text that the Athenians marched to Sardes, cp. c. 100 *supra*. The Eretrians have dropped out: in c. 102 *supra* their presence on the march to and from Sardes seems guaranteed.

συλλογῆς . . συνυφανθῆναι. The expression is somewhat obscure. *συλλογὴ* would seem to refer to the combination, conscription, co-operation (*coïtio*, Schweig.) of Athenians and Ionians: *συνυφανθῆναι* should refer primarily to devising, weaving, plans: *ταῦτα* would *prima facie* apply to the capture and conflagration of Sardes. There is, in short, in the passage a confusion of (*a*) the terminology proper to describe the external course of events and of (*b*) the terminology proper to describe the internal designs or causality: (*a*) 1 *συλλογὴ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἰώνων*, 2 *Σάρδις ἁλούσας ἐμπ. ὑπὸ Ἀθ. καὶ Ἰ.*, 3 *τὸν ἡγεμόνα γενέσθαι τῆς συλλ. Ἀρισταγόρην*. (*b*) *ταῦτα συνυφανθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Μιλησίου*. *συνυφανθῆναι* can hardly mean "was undertaken" (as L. & S.). Cp. 6. 1.

5. **λέγεται**, not by Ionians: the story is obviously Athenian.

Ἰώνων οὐδένα λόγον ποιησάμενον. This is the traditional attitude of the Persian King towards Ionians. So Kyros 1. 153, so Kambyses 2. 1 (Xerxes otherwise, 8. 90). Hdt. is no admirer of the Ionians, see 4. 142. Whether he or his (Athenian) source is responsible for the remark is not clear. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxvi. f.

6. **οὐ καταπροΐξονται.** Yet it took him five years to reduce them, cost him at least one fleet, more than one army, and several generals, involved the reconquest of Thrace and Macedon, postponed the invasion of European Hellas, and in this way was of inestimable service to European Freedom. But not a word of this in Hdt. or his (Athenian) source.

7. **εἰρέσθαι.** Like Artaphrenes previously, c. 73 *supra*. (There was more excuse for Kyros in 546 B.C. asking the original question about the Spartans, 1. 153.) Dareios (*i.e.* Hdt.) has forgotten the wishes of Atossa 3. 134, and the mission of Demokedes and the spies, 3. 136 ff. Hdt. takes the story as he finds it. The formula is a standing one: cp. c. 13 *supra*.

8. **τὸ τόξον.** A graphic and appropriate touch. The anecdote has an oriental colour. There were poets and story-tellers in Athens quite equal to this (*e.g.* Aischyl. *Persae*). Cp. c. 18 *supra*, 6. 21 *infra*.

λαβόντα δὲ καὶ ἐπιθέντα δέ. The iteration of the δὲ separates and accentuates the actions.

9. **Ζεῦ** = Ahuramazda, *τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐράνου Δία καλέοντες* 1. 131 gives especial point to the symbolic act and prayer of the Persian king.

ἐκγενέσθαι. A good example of the aorist infinitive optative. Cp. *Il.* 7. 179 *Ζεῦ πάτερ ἢ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν ἢ Τυδέος υἱόν*, *Od.* 17. 354 *Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχόν μοι ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὄλβιον εἶναι.* Cp. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, § 241.

106 εἰπεῖν "δέσποτα, μέμνεο τῶν Ἀθηναίων." προστάξας δὲ ταῦτα εἶπε, καλέσας ἐς ὄψιν Ἱστιαῖον τὸν Μιλήσιον, [τὸν ὁ Δαρεῖος κατεῖχε χρόνον ἤδη πολλόν,] "πυνθάνομαι Ἱστιαῖε ἐπίτροπον τὸν σόν, τῷ σὺ Μίλητον ἐπέτρεψας, νεώτερα ἐς ἐμὲ πεποιηκέναι πρήγματα· ἄνδρας γάρ μοι ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρης ἠπείρου ἐπαγαγών, καὶ Ἴωνας σὺν αὐτοῖσι τοὺς δώσοντας ἐμοὶ δίκην τῶν ἐποίησαν, τούτους ἀναγνώσας ἅμα ἐκείνοισι ἕπεσθαι, Σαρδίων με ἀπεστέρησε. νῦν ὦν κῶς τοι ταῦτα φαίνεται ἔχειν καλῶς; κῶς δὲ ἄνευ τῶν σῶν βουλευμάτων τούτων τι ἐπρήχθη; ὅρα μὴ ἐξ ὑστέρης σεωυτὸν ἐν αἰτίῃ σχῇς." εἶπε πρὸς ταῦτα Ἱστιαῖος "βασιλεῦ, κοῖον ἐφθέγξαο ἔπος, ἐμὲ βουλεῦσαι πρῆγμα ἐκ τοῦ σοί τι ἢ μέγα ἢ σμικρὸν ἔμελλε λυπηρὸν ἀνασχήσειν; τί δ' ἂν ἐπιδιζήμενος ποιέοιμι ταῦτα, τεῦ δὲ ἐνδεὴς ἐών; τῷ πάρα μὲν πάντα ὅσα περ σοί, πάντων δὲ πρὸς σέο βουλευμάτων ἐπακούειν ἀξιεῦμαι. ἀλλ' εἴπερ τι τοιοῦτον οἷον σὺ εἴρηκας πρήσσει ὁ ἐμὸς ἐπίτροπος, ἴσθι αὐτὸν ἐπ' ἑωυτοῦ βαλόμενον πεποιηκέναι. ἀρχὴν δὲ ἔγωγε οὐδὲ ἐνδέκομαι τὸν λόγον, ὅκως τι Μιλήσιοι καὶ ὁ ἐμὸς ἐπίτροπος νεώτερον πρήσσουσι περὶ πρήγματα τὰ σά. εἰ δ' ἄρα τι τοιοῦτο ποιεῦσι καὶ σὺ τὸ ἐὸν ἀκήκοας ὦ βασιλεῦ, μάθε οἷον πρῆγμα ἐργάσαο ἐμὲ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἀνάσπαστον ποιήσας. Ἴωνες γὰρ οἴκασι ἐμεῦ ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν σφι γενομένου ποιῆσαι τῶν πάλαι ἵμερον εἶχον· ἐμέο δ' ἂν ἐόντος ἐν Ἰωνίῃ οὐδεμία πόλις ὑπεκίνησε. νῦν ὦν ὡς τάχος ἄπες με πορευθῆναι ἐς Ἰωνίην, ἵνα τοι κεῖνά τε πάντα καταρτίσω ἐς τὠυτὸ καὶ τὸν Μιλήτου ἐπίτροπον τοῦτον τὸν ταῦτα μηχανησάμενον ἐγχειρίθετον παραδῶ. ταῦτα δὲ κατὰ νόον τὸν σὸν ποιήσας, θεοὺς ἐπόμνυμι τοὺς βασιληίους μὴ μὲν πρότερον ἐκδύσασθαι τὸν ἔχων κιθῶνα καταβήσομαι ἐς Ἰωνίην, πρὶν ἄν τοι Σαρδὼ νῆσον τὴν μεγίστην

---

106. 2. τὸν . . πολλὸν *seclusit* Stein.

7. Σαρδίων με ἀπεστέρησε. Dareios had spent some time at Sardes 4. 85, 143, 5. 11, and would feel its loss the more acutely. A fine literary touch.

16. ἐπ' ἑωυτοῦ βαλόμενον, c. 73 *supra*.

19. τὸ ἐόν, 'the thing that is,' cp. c. 50 *supra*. *τῷ ἐόντι χρησάμενος* 1. 30, *τὰς δίκας ἀποβαίνειν κατὰ τὸ ἐὸν* 1. 97.

28. Σαρδώ. Histiaios presumes too far upon the king's geographical ignorance, in vowing the conquest of Sardinia before Naxos, the Kyklades, Euboea and Athens. The passage no doubt was intended to be Sardonically comic (*Σαρδίων . . Σαρδώ*), but the satire is crude. After the real subtlety and dramatic propriety of the speech of Histiaios the mere word-play is an artistic blot.

Σαρδὼ νῆσον τὴν μεγίστην. The conquest, or the colonisation of Sardinia, is an old idea with the Ionians (cp. 1. 170, c. 124 *infra*, 6. 2). As to its size: Freeman (*Sicily*, i. pp. 2, 241) accepts the Herodotean view, which is certainly erroneous. Kiepert has: "wrongly supposed by the ancients to be the largest island in the Mediterranean," *Manual of Geography*, § 243. Stanford's Compendium, *Europe* (1885) p. 297, makes Sicily "the largest island in the Mediterranean." In the excellent *Epitome of Geography* for the use of National Schools of Ireland (Dublin,

δασμοφόρον ποιήσω." Ἱστιαῖος μὲν λέγων ταῦτα διέβαλλε, 107
Δαρεῖος δὲ ἐπείθετο καί μιν ἀπίει, ἐντειλάμενος, ἐπεὰν τὰ ὑπέσχετό οἱ ἐπιτελέα ποιήσῃ, παραγίνεσθαί οἱ ὀπίσω ἐς τὰ Σοῦσα.

Ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἡ ἀγγελίη τε περὶ τῶν Σαρδίων παρὰ βασιλέα 108
ἀνήιε καὶ Δαρεῖος τὰ περὶ τὸ τόξον ποιήσας Ἱστιαίῳ ἐς λόγους ἦλθε καὶ Ἱστιαῖος μεμετιμένος ὑπὸ Δαρείου ἐκομίζετο ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, ἐν τούτῳ παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐγίνετο τάδε. πολιορκέοντι τῷ Σαλαμινίῳ Ὀνησίλῳ Ἀμαθουσίους ἐξαγγέλλεται νηυσὶ στρατιὴν πολλὴν ἄγοντα Περσικὴν Ἀρτύβιον ἄνδρα Πέρσην προσδόκιμον ἐς τὴν Κύπρον εἶναι· πυθόμενος δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ὀνήσιλος κήρυκας διέπεμπε ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην ἐπικαλεύμενός σφεας, Ἴωνες δὲ οὐκ ἐς μακρὴν βουλευσάμενοι ἧκον πολλῷ στόλῳ. Ἴωνές τε

1857) Sardinia is described as "considerably larger than Corsica, being about 160 miles long from north to south, and 90 miles broad" p. 195, while Sicily is given as 180 miles long from east to west, with an eastern side of about 150, p. 181. Mackay's *Elements of Geography*, 1867, p. 119, gives the area of Sicily, "the largest island in the Mediterranean," as 10,556 sq. miles, and the area of Sardinia "the second largest island in the Mediterranean" as 9167 sq. miles. So too Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, i. 345-353, gives the 'official' sizes (1883) Sicily 29,240 sq. km., Sardinia 24,250 sq. km. Baedeker, *Southern Italy* (1893), p. 225, mentions that some recent estimates enlarge the area to 25,800 sq. km. Cp. c. 31 *supra*.

107. 1. **διέβαλλε**, as in c. 50 *supra*.

108. 3. **μεμετιμένος**. An extraordinary formation from *μεθίημι* (*μετίημι*), cp. 6. 61.

ἐκομίζετο is a strict imperfect.

4. **ἐν τούτῳ παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ**. This chronological indication is more precise than acceptable. Nor is it really precise. The news about Sardes must surely have reached the king before the opening of the second year of the war (cp. c. 105 *supra*); the episode of the bow, the interview with Histiaios, were affairs of minutes merely: the journey of Histiaios down to 'the sea' (Ionia, or Phoenicia) was a longer business. At best, this passage cannot be taken to prove more than that before Histiaios reached Sardes (6. 1) the war in Kypros had been concluded (c. 116 *infra*). It might further be argued that the siege of Amathus was in progress during the winter (498-7 B.C.). But if the king's fleet had been heavily defeated in 498 B.C. (*vide* c. 99 *supra*) the next year (= 497 B.C.) is full soon to see the Phoenicians at work again off Kypros. Cp. Appendix V.

τάδε. What follows: down to c. 115, or even to the end of the Book.

5. **νηυσί.** Probably Phoenician, though the forces are Persian under a Persian general. But cp. 6. 6 *infra*.

6. **Ἀρτύβιον.** This name is omitted in the list of proper names given in Rawlinson, vol. iii.[3] 539 ff.

8. **Ἴωνες οὐκ ἐ. μ. β.** This is the first hint in the actual narrative of the Ionian revolt of the confederate council and authority. The brevity of the deliberation on this occasion cannot be adduced as a proof of the folly or cowardice of the Ionians. They seem to have understood the advantage of supporting the revolt in Kypros as well as the Athenians understood the advantage of supporting the revolt in Ionia. The brevity of the deliberation indicates, however, that the confederate council was in full working order, and had probably been directing affairs hitherto, although Hdt. has said nothing about it; and also that the revolt of Kypros had been part of the general and concerted programme. Cp. c. 104 *supra*.

9. **πολλῷ στόλῳ.** Hdt.'s estimates in this narrative are nearly all vague, cp. c. 100, or exaggerated, cc. 102, 118-120. With the *parataxis* following, cp. 4. 199.

δὴ παρῆσαν ἐς τὴν Κύπρον καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι νηυσὶ διαβάντες ἐκ τῆς Κιλικίης ἤισαν ἐπὶ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα πεζῇ. τῇσι δὲ νηυσὶ οἱ Φοίνικες περιέπλεον τὴν ἄκρην αἳ καλεῦνται Κληῖδες τῆς Κύπρου.

109 τούτου δὲ τοιούτου γινομένου ἔλεξαν οἱ τύραννοι τῆς Κύπρου, συγκαλέσαντες τῶν Ἰώνων τοὺς στρατηγούς, "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, αἵρεσιν ὑμῖν δίδομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ Κύπριοι ὁκοτέροισι βούλεσθε προσφέρεσθαι, ἢ Πέρσῃσι ἢ Φοίνιξι. εἰ μὲν γὰρ πεζῇ βούλεσθε ταχθέντες Περσέων διαπειρᾶσθαι, ὥρη ἂν εἴη ὑμῖν ἐκβάντας ἐκ τῶν νεῶν τάσσεσθαι πεζῇ, ἡμέας δὲ ἐς τὰς νέας ἐσβαίνειν τὰς ὑμετέρας Φοίνιξι ἀνταγωνιευμένους· εἰ δὲ Φοινίκων μᾶλλον βούλεσθε διαπειρᾶσθαι, ποιέειν χρεόν ἐστι ὑμέας, ὁκότερα ἂν δὴ τούτων ἕλησθε, ὅκως τὸ κατ᾽ ὑμέας ἔσται ἥ τε Ἰωνίη καὶ ἡ Κύπρος ἐλευθέρη." εἶπαν Ἴωνες πρὸς ταῦτα "ἡμέας δὲ ἀπέπεμψε τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων φυλάξοντας τὴν θάλασσαν,

---

11. **τῇσι δὲ νηυσί.** Did the Phoenician vessels ship the Persian troops across from Kilikia (perhaps the Aleian plain, cp. 6. 95 *infra*) to Kypros, and then proceed round 'the Keys,' or were not two separate fleets employed, transports and men-of-war?

12. **Κληῖδες.** If the text is complete Hdt. is wrong in giving the name to the *ἄκρη*. *εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ μὲν* Κλεῖδες *νησία δύο προσκείμενα τῇ* Κύπρῳ *κατὰ τὰ ἑωθινὰ μέρη τῆς νήσου*, Strabo 682. The plural form of the name makes for the islands not for the promontory. There are half-a-dozen rocks to which the name applies; cp. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, pp. 81, 82.

109. 1. **οἱ τύραννοι . . τοὺς στρατηγούς** (c. 38). The 'tyrants' of Kypros here appear as the champions of freedom, at least from the foreign yoke, and as allies of the republican Ionians. The hostility and competition of Hellene and Phoenician in Kypros sufficiently explain the anomaly. A parallel case is supplied by Sicily, where the Hellenic tyrant is the champion of Hellenism against the Carthaginian. Cp. 7. 165 ff. and contr. c. 37 *supra*, 4. 137.

3. **αἵρεσιν.** This amphibious idea, that the same soldiers could fight equally well on sea and on land, would imply a comparatively rudimentary condition of the arts of war at the time, if the recorded offer was ever made. The offer no doubt is confined to the fighting-men: the oarsmen presumably were to stay where they were. Yet perhaps the anecdote is scarcely historical. The patronising airs of superiority assumed by Ionians towards Kypriotes would amuse an Athenian or a Dorian audience.

5. **Περσέων διαπειρᾶσθαι,** 'to put Persians to the proof.' *Φοινίκων δ.* just below, 'to make proof of Phoenicians.' Cp. 8. 9 *ἀπόπειραν αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι βουλόμενοι τῆς τε μάχης καὶ τοῦ διεκπλόου.* *ἀποπ.* is presumably less than *διαπ.*, cp. 1. 47, 2. 28 and 77 (*τῶν ἐγὼ ἐς διάπειραν ἀπικόμην*).

9. **ὅκως . . ἔσται.** Cp. Goodwin, *Gk. Moods and Tenses*, § 324 *ed. maj.*

11. **τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων,** cp. c. 108 *supra*. Says Grote, Pt. II. c. xxxv. (vol. iii. p. 502), "we hear now, for the first and the last time, of a tolerably efficient Pan-Ionic authority." But 1. 141 shows the Pan-Ionic council at work fifty years before, though Miletos then was excommunicate. The expression here may signify that Aristagoras the 'tyrant' had not sent the fleet, either because he had not authority, or because he was already off to Thrace. Cp. c. 126 *infra*. The historian's record here is anyway not devoid of a certain humour. The Ionians look down on 'Kyprians' much as Athenians upon Ionians, c. 69 *supra*. To avoid facing the Persian infantry (cp. 6. 112) on the plea of a strict adherence to discipline (cp. 6. 12) and to remind the men of Kypros of their servitude to the 'Mede' and exhort them to courage (cp. 4. 142), are malicious touches in Ionian portraiture, as painted by Hdt. Not but what

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἵνα Κυπριοισι τὰς νέας παραδόντες αὐτοὶ πεζῇ Πέρσῃσι προσφερώμεθα. ἡμεῖς μέν νυν ἐπ' οὗ ἐτάχθημεν, ταύτῃ πειρησόμεθα εἶναι χρηστοί· ὑμέας δὲ χρεόν ἐστι ἀναμνησθέντας οἷα ἐπάσχετε δουλεύοντες πρὸς τῶν Μήδων, γίνεσθαι ἄνδρας ἀγαθούς."

"Ιωνες μὲν τούτοισι ἀμείψαντο· μετὰ δὲ ἡκόντων ἐς τὸ 110
πεδίον τὸ Σαλαμινίων τῶν Περσέων, διέτασσον οἱ βασιλέες τῶν Κυπρίων, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους Κυπρίους κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους στρατιώτας ἀντιτάσσοντες, Σαλαμινίων δὲ καὶ Σολίων ἀπολέξαντες τὸ ἄριστον ἀντέτασσον Πέρσῃσι· Ἀρτυβίῳ δὲ τῷ στρατηγῷ τῶν Περσέων ἐθελοντὴς ἀντετάσσετο Ὀνήσιλος.
ἤλαυνε δὲ ἵππον ὁ Ἀρτύβιος δεδιδαγμένον πρὸς ὁπλίτην 111
ἵστασθαι ὀρθόν. πυθόμενος ὦν ταῦτα ὁ Ὀνήσιλος, ἦν γάρ οἱ ὑπασπιστὴς γένος μὲν Κὰρ τὰ δὲ πολέμια κάρτα δόκιμος καὶ ἄλλως λήματος πλέος, εἶπε πρὸς τοῦτον "πυνθάνομαι τὸν Ἀρτυβίου ἵππον ἱστάμενον ὀρθὸν καὶ ποσὶ καὶ στόματι κατεργάζεσθαι πρὸς τὸν ἂν προσενειχθῇ. σὺ ὦν βουλευσάμενος εἰπὲ αὐτίκα ὁκότερον βούλεαι φυλάξας πλῆξαι, εἴτε τὸν ἵππον

Ionians had proved themselves 'good men' 1. 169: but that was long syne, in the days of Kyros! The Ionian revolt was a mistake in Hdt.'s eyes. Cp. c. 98 *supra*.

110. 1. **ἡκόντων.** That the Persians should have been allowed to land at all seems rather a blunder: the landing may have been effected before the advent of the Ionians, c. 108.

τὸ πεδίον. The largest plain in Kypros, stretching inland to the very heart of the country (Nicosia). Cp. *Dict. Geogr.* ii. p. 877. Or rather perhaps stretching right across the island from E. to W. from the bay of Salamis to the bay of Soli: the larger watershed being towards the E. Cp. Lolling in I. Müller's *Handbuch*, iii. pp. 273 f., P. Gardner, *New Chapters in G. H.* p. 159.

2. **οἱ βασιλέες τῶν Κυπρίων** = *οἱ τύραννοι τῆς Κύπρου supra*. Against Persians they might be kings: compared with Greek *strategi* they were tyrants. But Hdt. scarcely uses the terms with such full intent.

4. **Σαλαμινίων καὶ Σολίων.** Salamis on the east coast, on the left bank of the river Pediaeus: Soli upon the north (or west) coast in nearly the same parallel at the western end of the great central plain (cp. previous note), both at this time perhaps special centres of Hellenic sympathy (cp. cc. 104 *supra*, 108 *infra*) and more or less Hellenised. Salamis from its name and position no doubt was originally Phoenician, the notion of a colony from Attic Salamis being pragmatic (cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] p. 321): nor is it likely that Soli was named from Solon (according to the etymologising anecdote in Plutarch, *Solon*, 26); there was another Soli on the coast of Kilikia, and Hdt. apparently takes Solon to Soli in Kypros, c. 113 *infra*. The Greek spoken at Soli was proverbially incorrect, even in the time of Hdt., cp. 4. 117. But the town was undoubtedly Hellenic, though whether founded from Athens or not can hardly be regarded as fully ascertained. The temple of Athene might be an evidence, or merely an explanation of the legend. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 321, inclines to regard the Athenian settlement as historic.

111. 1. **ἤλαυνε,** 'rode.' See next c. *ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου κατήμενος*. One might have expected the 'King of Salamis' to have been in a chariot (*πολεμιστήρια ἅρματα*, c. 113), but he appears to be fighting a-foot.

3. **πολέμια κτλ.,** like a true Karian. Cp. 1. 171.

5. **κατεργάζεσθαι.** Cp. *ἐξεργάζεσθαι* c. 19, *διεργάζεσθαι* c. 20 *supra*.

εἴτε αὐτὸν Ἀρτύβιον.” εἶπε πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ ὀπάων αὐτοῦ “ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἕτοιμος μὲν ἐγώ εἰμι ποιέειν καὶ ἀμφότερα καὶ τὸ ἕτερον αὐτῶν, καὶ πάντως τὸ ἂν σὺ ἐπιτάσσῃς· ὡς μέντοι ἔμοιγε δοκέει εἶναι τοῖσι σοῖσι πρήγμασι προσφερέστερον, φράσω. βασιλέα μὲν καὶ στρατηγὸν χρεὸν εἶναί φημι βασιλέι τε καὶ στρατηγῷ προσφέρεσθαι. ἤν τε γὰρ κατέλῃς ἄνδρα στρατηγόν, μέγα τοι γίνεται, καὶ δεύτερα, ἢν σὲ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ μὴ γένοιτο, ὑπὸ ἀξιοχρέου καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ἡμίσεα συμφορή· ἡμέας δὲ τοὺς ὑπηρέτας ἑτέροισί τε ὑπηρέτῃσι προσφέρεσθαι καὶ πρὸς ἵππον· τοῦ σὺ τὰς μηχανὰς μηδὲν φοβηθῇς· ἐγὼ γάρ τοι ὑποδέκομαι μή μιν ἀνδρὸς ἔτι γε μηδενὸς στήσεσθαι ἐναντίον.”

112 *Ταῦτα εἶπε, καὶ μεταυτίκα συνέμισγε τὰ στρατόπεδα πεζῇ καὶ νηυσί. νηυσὶ μέν νυν Ἴωνες ἄκροι γενόμενοι ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην ὑπερεβάλοντο τοὺς Φοίνικας, καὶ τούτων Σάμιοι ἠρίστευσαν· πεζῇ δέ, ὡς συνῆλθε τὰ στρατόπεδα, συμπεσόντα ἐμάχοντο. κατὰ δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἀμφοτέρους τάδε ἐγίνετο· ὡς προσεφέρετο πρὸς τὸν Ὀνήσιλον ὁ Ἀρτύβιος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου κατήμενος, ὁ Ὀνήσιλος κατὰ τὰ συνεθήκατο τῷ ὑπασπιστῇ παίει προσφερόμενον αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀρτύβιον· ἐπιβαλόντος δὲ τοῦ ἵππου τοὺς πόδας ἐπὶ τὴν Ὀνησίλου ἀσπίδα, ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Κὰρ δρεπάνῳ*
113 *πλήξας ἀπαράσσει τοῦ ἵππου τοὺς πόδας. Ἀρτύβιος μὲν δὴ*
ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Περσέων ὁμοῦ τῷ ἵππῳ πίπτει αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ.

---

8. **ὀπάων.** The form *ὀπάων* is certainly poetical, and to change it here into *ὀπέων* (with Förstemann, *de vocabulis quae videntur apud Herodotum poeticis*, 1892) would lower the tone of the anecdote.

11. **προσφερέστερον** is Stein's emendation for *προφερέστερον*. *προσφέρης* means ‘like.’ Why not *προσφορώτερον*, the *προσφερέστερον* having been introduced by *προσφέρεσθαι* just below? Stein, however, thinks that Hdt. wrote *προσφορέστερον*. Cp. his note *ad l.* (1882).

14. **δεύτερα,** *v.l.* *δεύτερον*, cp. c. 38 *supra*.

15. **ὑπὸ ἀξιοχρέου καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ἡμίσεα συμφορή.** This knightly maxim, and indeed the whole anecdote, go to show how superficial is the view which makes ‘romantic’ sentiment a peculiarity of northern nations, or of ‘mediaeval’ times. Hellenic antiquity and literature are saturated with romance: and among the romantic writers of Hellas Hdt. holds a very high place. Cp. Introduction, p. xxvii.

112. 1. **πεζῇ καὶ νηυσί.** Like the battles of the Eurymedon, Thuc. 1. 100 (*c.* 465 B.C.), and of Salamis again, Thuc. 1. 112, 4 (*c.* 449 B.C.), this was a double engagement, by sea and land. Hdt. could hardly have written the story of the Kyprian campaign of 497 B.C. without a thought of the later campaigns, in which the Athenians were engaged: and there may be a dim reference to those later days in the words *νηυσὶ μέν νυν Ἴωνες ἄκροι γενόμενοι ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην*. They might however only point the contrast with Lade. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxv ff.

3. **Σάμιοι ἠρίστευσαν.** The Aristeia of the Samians suggest one possible source of the narrative, though the Karian's achievement might well have been remembered in Karia, at Halikarnassos or elsewhere.

9. **ὁ Κὰρ δρεπάνῳ.** Cp. 7. 93.

10. **τοὺς πόδας.** Only the *fore* ones.

μαχομένων δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, Στησήνωρ τύραννος ἐὼν Κουρίου
προδιδοῖ ἔχων δύναμιν ἀνδρῶν περὶ ἑωυτὸν οὐ σμικρήν. οἱ δὲ
Κουριέες οὗτοι λέγονται εἶναι Ἀργείων ἄποικοι. προδόντων δὲ
τῶν Κουριέων αὐτίκα καὶ τὰ Σαλαμινίων πολεμιστήρια ἅρματα
τὠυτὸ τοῖσι Κουριεῦσι ἐποίεε. γινομένων δὲ τούτων κατυπέρ-
τεροι ἦσαν οἱ Πέρσαι τῶν Κυπρίων. τετραμμένου δὲ τοῦ
στρατοπέδου ἄλλοι τε ἔπεσον πολλοὶ καὶ δὴ καὶ Ὀνήσιλός τε ὁ
Χέρσιος, ὅς περ τὴν Κυπρίων ἀπόστασιν ἔπρηξε, καὶ ὁ Σολίων
βασιλεὺς Ἀριστόκυπρος ὁ Φιλοκύπρου, Φιλοκύπρου δὲ τούτου
τὸν Σόλων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἀπικόμενος ἐς Κύπρον ἐν ἔπεσι αἴνεσε
τυράννων μάλιστα. Ὀνησίλου μέν νυν Ἀμαθούσιοι, ὅτι σφέας 114
ἐπολιόρκησε, ἀποταμόντες τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκόμισαν ἐς Ἀμαθοῦντα
καί μιν ἀνεκρέμασαν ὑπὲρ τῶν πυλέων· κρεμαμένης δὲ τῆς
κεφαλῆς καὶ ἤδη ἐούσης κοίλης, ἐσμὸς μελισσέων ἐσδὺς ἐς αὐτὴν

---

113. 3. **Στησήνωρ.** Stesenor, the traitor, is a 'tyrant': Onesilos and Aristokypros, 'kings.' But the point cannot be pressed, cp. c. 109 *supra*. The name *Stasi*oecus appears at Curium, about 420 B.C. (Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 622).

Κούριον. On the Lykos, some 16 R. miles to the W. of Amathus, one of the nine city-states of Kypros. See c. 104 *supra*. Steph. B. *πόλις Κύπρου, ἀπὸ Κουρέως τοῦ Κινύρου παιδός.* Kinyras is a well-known figure in Kypros, but his sons according to Apollodorus (3. 14, 3) were Oxyporos and Adonis: Kureus is not known. Is the name connected with the *Κούρητες* and the cult of Zeus?

5. **λέγονται.** Hdt. doubts the statement (cp. 4. 184). The connexion, real or supposed, between 'Argos' and Kypros is suggestive, whichever of the two was the *terminus a quo*: the remark of Mr. Head's (*Hist. Num.* p. 620) that the weight standard of all the Kypriote silver money is at first the Aiginetic somewhat reduced, may point to later commercial relations, but might lead to a date too recent for the original settlements. But (1) archaeological evidence, especially 'Mykenaean' pottery, (2) the resemblance of the Kypriote and Arkadian dialects, and perhaps (3) the separate Kypriote syllabary (cp. Deeke, in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, p. 51, Hinrichs, in I. Müller, *Handbuch*, i. 365), go to show that Peloponnesian settlers were in Kypros before the close of the Mykenaean period. Cp. further, Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 318 ff.

12. **Σόλων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος,** cp. c. 110 *supra*. The visit of Solon to Kypros cannot have been later than 560-559 B.C. and might have been 20-30 years earlier. Upwards of sixty, it may be upwards of ninety, years thereafter the son of Philokypros, Solon's contemporary and friend, is killed in battle. The succession in this case appears as much too slow as in the former case of Onesilos (c. 104) too rapid.

ἐν ἔπεσι. Plutarch, *Solon* 26, says *ἐν ταῖς ἐλεγείαις*, and quotes them (cp. Bergk, *Poet. Lyr.* ii.[4] p. 47), from which it does not follow that Hdt. knew not an Epos from an Elegy, when he saw them, but only that the terms are used loosely. *ἔπη* = poetry, as distinguished from prose (*λόγοι*).

αἴνεσε τυράννων μάλιστα. It is not quite clear whether, in the eyes of Hdt., the act was a credit to Philokypros or a discredit to Solon. Anyway Solon may have seen that what suited Athens might not suit Soli, and have praised Philokypros though he blamed Peisistratos. The visits of Solon to Kypros, Egypt (cp. 2. 177) and Lydia (1. 29) may have had a politico-commercial object, at least in part.

114. 2. **ἐπολιόρκησε,** cc. 104, 105 *supra*. The victory of the Persians on land, and the retreat of the Ionian fleet, presumably relieved Amathus: even if the siege had not been already raised (cp. c. 110 *supra*).

κηρίων μιν ἐνέπλησε. τούτου δὲ γενομένου τοιούτου, ἐχρέωντο γὰρ περὶ αὐτῆς οἱ Ἀμαθούσιοι, ἐμαντεύθη σφι τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν κατελόντας θάψαι, Ὀνησίλῳ δὲ θύειν ὡς ἥρωϊ ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος,
115 καί σφι ποιεῦσι ταῦτα ἄμεινον συνοίσεσθαι. Ἀμαθούσιοι μέν νυν ἐποίευν ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ· Ἴωνες δὲ οἱ ἐν Κύπρῳ ναυμαχήσαντες ἐπείτε ἔμαθον τὰ πρήγματα τὰ Ὀνησίλου διεφθαρμένα καὶ τὰς πόλις τῶν Κυπρίων πολιορκευμένας τὰς ἄλλας πλὴν Σαλαμῖνος, ταύτην δὲ Γόργῳ τῷ προτέρῳ βασιλέι τοὺς Σαλαμινίους παραδόντας, αὐτίκα μαθόντες οἱ Ἴωνες ταῦτα ἀπέπλεον ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην. τῶν δὲ ἐν Κύπρῳ πολίων ἀντέσχε χρόνον ἐπὶ πλεῖστον πολιορκευμένη Σόλοι, τὴν πέριξ ὑπορύσσοντες τὸ τεῖχος πέμπτῳ μηνὶ εἷλον οἱ Πέρσαι.

116 Κύπριοι μὲν δὴ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐλεύθεροι γενόμενοι αὖτις ἐκ νέης κατεδεδούλωντο. Δαυρίσης δὲ ἔχων Δαρείου θυγατέρα καὶ Ὑμαίης τε καὶ Ὀτάνης ἄλλοι Πέρσαι στρατηγοί, ἔχοντες καὶ οὗτοι Δαρείου θυγατέρας, ἐπιδιώξαντες τοὺς ἐς Σάρδις στρατευ-

---

5. **ἐχρέωντο γάρ.** Where? of what God? The Kypriotes had a peculiar divination by swine, at least in the time of Pausanias (6. 2, 2), but the response seems to imply that the act went beyond a mere divination by splanchnoscopy, or such-like means. Perhaps one of the Apolline shrines in Asia minor was consulted: or possibly an Egyptian oracle. Cp. 2. 83.

7. **θύειν ὡς ἥρωϊ** sounds like the direction of an Hellenic oracle, cp. c. 47 *supra*.

8. **ἄμεινον συνοίσεσθαι**, c. 82 *supra*.

115. 2. **ἐποίευν ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ** looks certainly like a visit of Hdt. to Amathus, or at least Kypros: perhaps on the way to or from Tyre (2. 44) or Egypt. The mere formula, however, is not in itself conclusive; cp. 4. 124 and Introduction, p. liii, and § 20.

4. **τὰς πόλις . . τὰς ἄλλας πλὴν Σαλαμῖνος** must be understood to refer only to the towns which had seceded from the Persians. Cp. c. 104 *supra*. All the cities of Kypros were apparently walled.

5. **Γόργῳ.** Gorgos still king at the date of the expedition of Xerxes, 7. 98.

8. **ὑπορύσσοντες.** Cp. the Persian operations at Barke, 4. 200, where they digged *ὀρύγματα ὑπόγαια φέροντα ἐς τὸ τεῖχος*, in that case unsuccessfully.

9. **πέμπτῳ μηνί**, 'after four months.' Probably late in the autumn of 496 B.C. or in the winter following. If strict calendar months underlie this date, the time might be reduced to something just over three natural months.

116. 1. **ἐνιαυτόν**, 497-6 B.C. more or less, the revolt of Kypros being dated to the close of the first campaign (cp. cc. 103, 104 *supra*), and the summons and advent of the Ionians (c. 108 *supra*) falling apparently after the operations in the Hellespont and the accession of Karia (cc. 103, 117), in the summer of the second campaign. But cp. 6. 6 *infra*. Whether this 'year' includes the 'four months' just indicated is not quite clear: probably not.

2. **κατεδεδούλωντο.** The tense ought to signify that the reduction of Kypros was completed before what is next described took place: but that is rather difficult to believe. The pursuit of the Ionians who had marched to Sardes surely must have taken place long before the reduction of Kypros, possibly indeed before even the revolt of Kypros (c. 104 *supra*). The tense is graphic. Cp. *ηὔξηντο* c. 78 *supra*.

ἔχων, 'having to wife' (L. & S. *sub voc.* A. I. 4). The name Daurises is omitted in Rawlinson's list (iii.[2] p. 544), but is presumably from the same root as Dareios. Daurises may have been the governor of the *τρίτος νομὸς* 3. 90, cp. c. 102 *supra*. Daurises has two (inferior) colleagues c. 121 *infra*. The two other 'strategi' seem to be more

σαμένους Ἰώνων καὶ ἐσαράξαντές σφεας ἐς τὰς νέας, τῇ μάχῃ ὡς
ἐπεκράτησαν, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ἐπιδιελόμενοι τὰς πόλις ἐπόρθεον.
Δαυρίσης μὲν τραπόμενος πρὸς τὰς ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ πόλις εἷλε 117
μὲν Δάρδανον, εἷλε δὲ Ἄβυδόν τε καὶ Περκώτην καὶ Λάμψακον
καὶ Παισόν. ταύτας μὲν ἐπ' ἡμέρῃ ἑκάστῃ αἵρεε, ἀπὸ δὲ
Παισοῦ ἐλαύνοντί οἱ ἐπὶ Πάριον πόλιν ἦλθε ἀγγελίη τοὺς
Κᾶρας τὠυτὸ Ἴωσι φρονήσαντας ἀπεστάναι ἀπὸ Περσέων.
ἀποστρέψας ὦν ἐκ τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου ἤλαυνε τὸν στρατὸν ἐπὶ
τὴν Καρίην. καί κως ταῦτα τοῖσι Καρσὶ ἐξαγγέλθη πρότερον 118
ἢ τὸν Δαυρίσην ἀπικέσθαι· πυθόμενοι δὲ οἱ Κᾶρες συνελέγοντο
ἐπὶ Λευκάς τε στήλας καλεομένας καὶ ποταμὸν Μαρσύην, ὃς

---

closely connected together in their command. The patronymics unfortunately are not given. Hymaias is not commemorated elsewhere, except c. 122 *infra*. Otanes is the son of Sisamnes, c. 25 *supra* στρατηγὸς τῶν παραθαλασσίων ἀνδρῶν, ὁ τρίτος στρατηγὸς c. 123 *infra*.

5. **Ἰώνων.** The Athenians and Eretrians have disappeared: but cp. cc. 102, 103 *supra*.

τῇ μάχῃ seems naturally to refer to the Persian victory related c. 102 *supra* and placed by Hdt. immediately after the burning of Sardes, on the way back. After the battle, as appears from this passage, the Ionians are driven into their ships, and the victorious Persians proceed to capture and devastate the cities. In the previous narrative, however, the battle is followed by the revolt of Karia and Kaunos from the Persians—a curious consequence of a crushing defeat of the revolters!—and by the liberation of the Hellespont and Kypros (for a year). The narrative of Hdt. is evidently incomplete, and probably inaccurate. If a defeat was inflicted upon the Ionians, Athenians and Eretrians on the way back from Sardes (c. 102), it cannot have been a crushing one. If the Ionians were heavily defeated in a great battle by the three generals here named for the first time it was in a subsequent campaign, either next year, when the Ionian fleet was off Kypros, or more probably two years later, after the return of the fleet, and the reduction of Kypros, as is here perhaps indicated. The revolt of Karia (c. 103 *supra*) is mentioned again in the next chapter (117), in connexion with the operations of Daurises against the Hellespontine towns.

117. 1. **τὰς ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ πόλις.** The Hellespontine cities had joined the Ionians, under pressure, apparently after the departure of the Athenians, c. 103 *supra*. The operations of Daurises described in this chapter might fall into 497 B.C. Hdt. seems to conceive them as preceding the revolt of the Karians, cp. c. 103 *supra*. Byzantion and all the other cities are mentioned there; including, presumably, those specified c. 26 *supra*. But the cities enumerated here lie to the S.W. on the Asian side of the Hellespont, properly so called (cp. 4. 85), and are enumerated in strictly geographical order from S.W. to N.E. (cp. 7. 43). They may have joined the Ionians from the first, or at any rate months before the revolt of Byzantion. By the chronological indications here given the recapture of these Hellespontine cities should fall after their revolt and before the revolt of Karia (cp. c. 103 *supra*), or at least before the news of the revolt of the Karians reached Daurises at Paisos. This would presumably be the season after the burning of Sardes (cp. c. 103).

118. 1. **ἐξαγγέλθη.** The Karians, like the Kyprians, c. 108 *supra*, are well informed of the movements of the Persians. Hdt.'s silence in respect to the Dorian cities in Karia is remarkable.

3. *Leukae Stelae* has not been identified. Strabo, 658, mentions a quarry of specially good marble above Mylassa. The Idrian country is the country about Stratonicaea. See Rawlinson *ad l.*

Marsyas, 'a river Marsyas'— not the celebrated Marsyas ("the mystic storied Marsyas"), which, though it flowed into the Maeander, did not rise in Idrias but near Kelaenae = Apameia in Phrygia. Cp. 7. 26. (On the latter

ῥέων ἐκ τῆς Ἰδριάδος χώρης ἐς τὸν Μαίανδρον ἐκδιδοῖ. συλλεχθέντων δὲ τῶν Καρῶν ἐνθαῦτα ἐγίνοντο βουλαὶ ἄλλαι τε πολλαὶ καὶ ἀρίστη γε δοκέουσα εἶναι ἐμοὶ Πιξωδάρου τοῦ Μαυσώλου ἀνδρὸς Κινδυέος, ὃς τοῦ Κιλίκων βασιλέος Συεννέσιος εἶχε θυγατέρα· τούτου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡ γνώμη ἔφερε διαβάντας τὸν Μαίανδρον τοὺς Κᾶρας καὶ κατὰ νώτου ἔχοντας τὸν ποταμὸν οὕτω συμβάλλειν, ἵνα μὴ ἔχοντες ὀπίσω φεύγειν οἱ Κᾶρες αὐτοῦ τε μένειν ἀναγκαζόμενοι γινοίατο ἔτι ἀμείνονες τῆς φύσιος. αὕτη μέν νυν οὐκ ἐνίκα ἡ γνώμη, ἀλλὰ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι κατὰ νώτου γίνεσθαι τὸν Μαίανδρον μᾶλλον ἢ σφίσι, δηλαδὴ ἢν φυγὴ τῶν Περσέων γένηται καὶ ἑσσωθέωσι τῇ συμβολῇ, ὡς οὐκ ἀπο-

119 νοστήσουσι ἐς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐσπίπτοντες. μετὰ δὲ παρεόντων καὶ διαβάντων τὸν Μαίανδρον τῶν Περσέων, ἐνθαῦτα ἐπὶ τῷ Μαρσύῃ ποταμῷ συνέβαλόν τε τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι οἱ Κᾶρες καὶ μάχην ἐμαχέσαντο ἰσχυρὴν καὶ ἐπὶ χρόνον πολλόν, τέλος δὲ ἑσσώθησαν διὰ πλῆθος. Περσέων μὲν δὴ ἔπεσον ἄνδρες ἐς δισχιλίους, Καρῶν δὲ ἐς μυρίους. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ οἱ διαφυγόντες

---

see D. G. Hogarth, in *J. H. S.* vol. ix. (1888), pp. 343 ff.)

5. **βουλαί.** The Karians are assumed to be acting independently of the Ionians: but the latter come to their support, c. 120. Are these operations to be conceived as contemporaneous with the campaign in Kypros?

6. *Pixodaros* son of Mausolos; from his connexion with Syennesis (cp. 1. 74, 7. 98) and from the recurrence of the names, Mausolos as a Karian Dynast, and in Halikarnassos, 377-353 B.C., a century after the time of Hdt. (cp. Diodor. 15. 90, 3), Pixodaros 341-335 B.C. (B. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 533), as well as from the way Hdt. here speaks of Pixodaros, it may be conjectured that he was connected with Artemisia of Halikarnassos (7. 99, 8. *passim*), and though described as a man of Kindys, an insignificant place, had a dynastic position. Busolt, *Gr. G.* ii. 33, remarks that Karian dynasts (from their hereditary position) were more independent of the Persian power than Greek tyrants.

7. **εἶχε**, c. 116 *supra*.

11. **τῆς φύσιος.** Which was good to start with. Cp. c. 111 *supra*. The question of the advantage and disadvantage of crossing a river under such circumstances had been discussed before: 1. 205-207. It was a problem bound to arise in warfare again and again (cp. 9. 36, 37). The argument of Pixodaros (δηλαδὴ κτλ.) is less far-fetched than that put into the mouth of Kroisos 1. 207.

14. **ὡς**, 'that they will be driven into the river and stay there.' Such was the opinion, humorously recorded or inferred (δηλαδή) by Herodotus. The negative *οὐκ* shows that this is not a final sentence. Cp. R. Heiligenstädt, *de enuntiatorum finalium usu Herodoteo* etc., 1883, p. 54.

119. 2. **διαβάντων.** Coming from the north the Persians would cross the Maeander. The battle of the lesser Marsyas, in Karia, is only the first of three great battles, which succeed each other rapidly in the narrative of Hdt. (cc. 119, 120, 121). In the first of these 10,000 (*sic*) Karians are slain: the second is a still more crushing defeat: the third is a brilliant victory. The intervals which elapsed between these three engagements are not indicated: days, or months, or years? Cp. Appendix V.

6. **δισχιλίους . . μυρίους.** These are the first numerical estimates which occur in Hdt.'s account of the Ionian revolt, and even these are evidently round numbers, and probably exaggerated. Five times as many Karians as Persians fell in the engagement. Cp. c. 100.

*αὐτῶν κατειλήθησαν ἐς Λάβραυνδα ἐς Διὸς στρατίου ἱρόν, μέγα
τε καὶ ἅγιον ἄλσος πλατανίστων. μοῦνοι δὲ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν
Κᾶρές εἰσι οἳ Διὶ στρατίῳ θυσίας ἀνάγουσι. κατειληθέντες δὲ
ὦν οὗτοι ἐνθαῦτα ἐβουλεύοντο περὶ σωτηρίης, ὁκότερα ἢ παρα-
δόντες σφέας αὐτοὺς Πέρσῃσι ἢ ἐκλιπόντες τὸ παράπαν τὴν
Ἀσίην ἄμεινον πρήξουσι. βουλευομένοισι δέ σφι ταῦτα παραγί- 120
νονται βοηθέοντες Μιλήσιοί τε καὶ οἱ τούτων σύμμαχοι· ἐνθαῦτα
δὲ τὰ μὲν πρότερον οἱ Κᾶρες ἐβουλεύοντο μετῆκαν, οἱ δὲ αὖτις
πολεμέειν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀρτέοντο. καὶ ἐπιοῦσί τε τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι
συμβάλλουσι καὶ μαχεσάμενοι ἐπὶ πλέον ἢ πρότερον ἑσσώθησαν·
πεσόντων δὲ τῶν πάντων πολλῶν μάλιστα Μιλήσιοι ἐπλήγησαν.
μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ τρῶμα ἀνέλαβόν τε καὶ ἀνεμαχέσαντο οἱ Κᾶρες· 121
πυθόμενοι γὰρ ὡς στρατεύεσθαι ὁρμέαται οἱ Πέρσαι ἐπὶ τὰς
πόλις σφέων, ἐλόχησαν τὴν ἐν Πηδάσῳ ὁδόν, ἐς τὴν ἐμπεσόντες
οἱ Πέρσαι νυκτὸς διεφθάρησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ αὐτῶν
Δαυρίσης καὶ Ἀμόργης καὶ Σισιμάκης· σὺν δέ σφι ἀπέθανε καὶ
Μύρσος ὁ Γύγεω. τοῦ δὲ λόχου τούτου ἡγεμὼν ἦν Ἡρακλείδης
Ἰβανώλλιος ἀνὴρ Μυλασσεύς.*

---

7. **Λάβραυνδα.** Labraunda described by Strabo, 659, as a village (*κώμη*) on the mountain pass between Alabanda and Mylassa, some 60 stadia distant from the latter, of which it was a dependency. The MSS. vary in the spelling of the name: *λάβραυνδα* AB, *Λάβρανδα* C (adopted by van H.), *λάβρυνδα* Pr. Meineke reads *Λάβραυνδα* *apud* Strabonem.

Διὸς στρατίου. Strabo *l. c.* clearly distinguishes *Ζεὺς στράτιος* worshipped by the locality, and especially by the people of Mylassa, from the *Κάριος Ζεύς* (common to Karians, Lydians, and Mysians, *ὡς ἀδελφοῖς*, cp. c. 66 *supra*). There was also a shrine of Zeus in Mylassa itself, under the extraordinary title Osogoa (Ὀσογῶα indecl.) or Osogos, identified with Poseidon. Cp. Preller, *Gr. Myth.* i.[3] 475. On the formula *τῶν ἡ. ἴδ.*, cp. Introduction, p. civ.

10. **σωτηρίης.** Safety often involves flight, cp. c. 98 *supra*. The complete evacuation of Asia was a frequently discussed theme or threat. Cp. 1. 170, 9. 106 (c. 124 *infra*, 6. 3).

120. 2. **Μιλήσιοί τε καὶ οἱ τούτων σύμμαχοι.** Represents presumably the Ionians acting under the orders of *τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων*, for it can hardly be supposed that the fleet acted under orders of the Confederate Council, while the land-forces were left to act independently. Or, are the *σύμμαχοι* of Miletos merely some smaller towns immediately dependent on, or attached to, her? Hdt. unfortunately does not locate this battle, in which the most crushing defeat was inflicted upon the rebels: yet the terms of the narrative, if pressed, would serve to locate it in Labranda (*βουλευομένοισι . . παραγίνονται.* The Karian council was being held at Labranda. See previous chapter).

121. 1. **μετὰ δέ.** Unfortunately Hdt. does not specify how long after.

ἀνέλαβόν τε καὶ ἀνεμαχέσαντο. Notwithstanding two tremendous defeats, cc. 119, 120, in the lighter of which they had lost well-nigh 10,000 men, and had thereupon contemplated surrender or exile as the only alternatives! For the construction cp. 8. 109, Themistocles loquitur, *ἄνδρας ἐς ἀναγκαίην ἀπειληθέντας νενικημένους ἀναμάχεσθαί τε καὶ ἀναλαμβάνειν τὴν προτέρην κακότητα.*

3. **ἐν Πηδάσῳ** is an emendation by H. Stephanus. On the place, cp. 1. 175.

6. *Myrsos*, son of Gyges, was presumably a Mermnad, cp. 3. 122 and 1. 7.

Was Herakleides, son of Ibanollis of Mylassa, perhaps a brother of Oliatos, son of Ibanollis, of Mylassa, mentioned c. 37 *supra*?

7. Mylassa is about half-way by

122 Οὗτοι μέν νυν τῶν Περσέων οὕτω διεφθάρησαν· Ὑμαίης δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐὼν τῶν ἐπιδιωξάντων τοὺς ἐς Σάρδις στρατευσαμένους Ἰώνων, τραπόμενος ἐς τὸν Προποντίδα εἷλε Κίον τὴν Μυσίην· ταύτην δὲ ἐξελών, ὡς ἐπύθετο τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἐκλελοιπέναι Δαυρίσην καὶ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ Καρίης, καταλιπὼν τὴν Προποντίδα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἦγε τὸν στρατόν, καὶ εἷλε μὲν Αἰολέας πάντας ὅσοι τὴν Ἰλιάδα νέμονται, εἷλε δὲ Γέργιθας τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν· αὐτός τε Ὑμαίης αἱρέων
123 ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνεα νούσῳ τελευτᾷ ἐν τῇ Τρῳάδι. οὗτος μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἐτελεύτησε, Ἀρταφρένης δὲ ὁ Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος καὶ Ὀτάνης ὁ τρίτος στρατηγὸς ἐτάχθησαν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰωνίην καὶ τὴν προσεχέα Αἰολίδα στρατεύεσθαι. Ἰωνίης μέν νυν Κλαζομενὰς αἱρέουσι, Αἰολέων δὲ Κύμην.

124 Ἁλισκομενέων δὲ τῶν πολίων, ἦν γὰρ ὡς διέδεξε Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μιλήσιος ψυχὴν οὐκ ἄκρος, ὃς ταράξας τὴν Ἰωνίην καὶ ἐγκερασάμενος πρήγματα μεγάλα δρησμὸν ἐβούλευε ὁρέων ταῦτα·

---

land between Halikarnassos and Miletos; and was, according to Strabo, 658, one of the three principal towns of the Karian *μεσόγαια*, Stratonicaea and Alabanda being the other two. There is local colour and memory in this record, apparently.

122. 2. **τῶν ἐπιδιωξάντων**, c. 116 *supra*. The operations of Hymaiss on the Propontis obviously synchronise with those of Daurises on the Hellespont, c. 117 *supra*.

3. *Kios*, a city in Mysia, "like most other towns upon this coast was a colony of the Milesians" (R.). The name is also found upon the European side, attached to a river descending Mt. Haimos, 4. 49 *supra*.

5. **ἐπὶ Καρίης**, c. 117 *supra*.

6. **Ἑλλήσποντος** is here obviously used in the strict sense, exclusive of the Propontis and Bosporos. Cp. c. 117 *supra*.

7. **Γέργιθαι.** Cp. 7. 43.

8. **τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν**, c. 13 *supra*.

αἱρέων, imperfect, 'before completing the reduction.'

9. **ἔθνεα** has a slight suggestion of barbarism, cp. c. 2 *supra*.

123. 2. **οὕτω.** While Daurises had met, or was to meet, his fate in battle c. 121 *supra*. Otanes is the only general left of the three sons-in-law of the king commissioned to quell the revolt, c. 116 *supra*.

3. **ἐτάχθησαν.** The phrase would hardly be correct if Artaphrenes were the guiding spirit and highest authority in these strategic plans. The campaign against Ionia was presumably carried out synchronously with the campaigns for the recovery of the Hellespont, Aiolis and Karia: and the operations of Daurises in the Hellespont, and afterwards in Karia, of Hymaias on the Propontis and afterwards on the Hellespont, and of Otanes in Ionia are to be thought of as approximately synchronous. Why Daurises, rather than Otanes, moved down into Karia is not very evident. The whole plan of operations may have been concerted in Susa by the king and his counsellors, including the renegade Hellenes, not without reference to the operations against Kypros, the basis of which was Kilikia. See further on the Ionian navy list at Lade, 6. 8 *infra*.

124. 1. **ἁλισκομενέων**, imperfect. On the chronology cp. c. 126 *infra*. Aristagoras apparently had never quitted Miletos after his return (c. 98 *supra*) in the winter 499-8 B.C.

ἦν γάρ. Cp. *ἦν γάρ, ὡς διέδεξε, ὀργὴν ἄκρος* 1. 73, of Kyaxares.

3. **ἐγκερασάμενος** with *ταράξας* is rather suggestive of a potion or drug, but the metaphor may be vague. Cp. c. 105 *supra*. Hdt. adheres to his views that (1) Aristagoras was the author of the Ionian revolt, (2) the revolt was fore-

πρὸς δέ οἱ καὶ ἀδύνατα ἐφάνη βασιλέα Δαρεῖον ὑπερβαλέσθαι·
πρὸς ταῦτα δὴ ὧν συγκαλέσας τοὺς συστασιώτας ἐβουλεύετο,
λέγων ὡς ἄμεινόν σφισι εἴη κρησφύγετόν τι ὑπάρχον εἶναι, ἢν
ἄρα ἐξωθέωνται ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου, εἴτε δὴ ὧν ἐς Σαρδὼ ἐκ τοῦ
τόπου τούτου ἄγοι ἐς ἀποικίην, εἴτε ἐς Μύρκινον τὴν Ἠδωνῶν,
τὴν Ἱστιαῖος ἐτείχεε παρὰ Δαρείου δωρεὴν λαβών. ταῦτα
ἐπειρώτα ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης. Ἑκαταίου μέν νυν τοῦ Ἡγησάνδρου, 125
ἀνδρὸς λογοποιοῦ, τουτέων μὲν ἐς οὐδετέρην στέλλειν ἔφερε ἡ
γνώμη, ἐν Λέρῳ δὲ τῇ νήσῳ τεῖχος οἰκοδομησάμενον ἡσυχίην
ἄγειν, ἢν ἐκπέσῃ ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου· ἔπειτα δὲ ἐκ ταύτης ὁρμώ-
μενον κατελεύσεσθαι ἐς τὴν Μίλητον. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ Ἑκαταῖος 126
συνεβούλευε, αὐτῷ δὲ Ἀρισταγόρῃ ἡ πλείστη γνώμη ἦν ἐς τὴν
Μύρκινον ἀπάγειν. τὴν μὲν δὴ Μίλητον ἐπιτράπει Πυθαγόρῃ
ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἀστῶν δοκίμῳ, αὐτὸς δὲ παραλαβὼν πάντα τὸν βου-
λόμενον ἔπλεε ἐς τὴν Θρηίκην, καὶ ἔσχε τὴν χώρην ἐπ' ἣν

---

doomed to failure. Cp. c. 98 *supra*, 6. 1 *infra*.

δρησμὸν ἐβούλευε. Like Xerxes after Salamis 8. 94, 100; cp. 8. 4, 18, 75.

ταῦτα. The progress of the Persians who were closing in upon Miletos on the land side.

4. **βασιλέα Δαρεῖον.** A testimony to the ultimate and presiding spirit of the empire, behind the satraps and strategi, who were not invincible. Cp. 6. 13 *infra*.

5. **συστασιώτας**, c. 70 *supra*. The στάσις here is a double one: (1) against the king, (2) against the other Ionians, or even Milesians. Surrender is not contemplated, as by the Karians, c. 119 *supra*.

6. **κρησφύγετον.** Used by Hdt. always of a fortified place. Cp. 8. 51, 9. 15, 96.

7. **Σαρδώ**, c. 106 *supra*, 6. 2 *infra*.

9. **ἐτείχεε**, imperfect. Cp. c. 23 *supra*. Histiaios had not completed his work. The text in this passage (λέγων . . λαβών) seems hardly satisfactory. The words τὴν Ἱστιαῖος ἐτείχεε παρὰ Δαρείου δωρεὴν λαβὼν look like a gloss, the rather as ἐτείχεε is hardly accurate, and the remark in any case could not have occurred in the speech of Aristagoras. The words ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τούτου are clumsy. Even the report of Aristagoras' argument is open to doubt (λέγων . . Μιλήτου), for a κρησφύγετον he certainly had, in Myrkinos, and the point which emerges is whether he should lead his colony to Myrkinos or to Sardinia. Finally, there is in the text as it stands, an apparent aposiopesis (which would be obviated by bracketing λέγων . . Μιλήτου). But perhaps the objections are to be obviated by the supposition that Hdt. is here compressing a story which Hekataios had recorded more fully.

125. 1. **Ἑκαταίου.** Hekataios' suggestions, as reported by Hdt., are never acted on (cp. c. 36 *supra*); nor his views expressly approved (cp. 2. 143, 6. 137). If Hekataios really merely proposed ἡσυχίην ἄγειν ἐν Λέρῳ, to shelter in Leros, a small island off Miletos, till the war was over, his proposal was indeed absurd. The advice of Hekataios seems to have a better application to a political στάσις in Miletos, than to the given situation in a war with the Persians by sea and land; and it is possible that Hdt. has confused two occasions. Hekataios may have recommended the occupation of Leros: Hekataios may have opposed the flight of Aristagoras: but the assertion that Hekataios advocated the occupation of Leros as an alternative to the settlement in Sardinia, or in Thrace, may be a combination on Hdt.'s own part, intended to make Hekataios ridiculous (cp. 4. 36).

126. 3. **Πυθαγόρῃ**, possibly a near relative, cp. c. 37 *supra*.

5. **ἔσχε τὴν χώρην ἐπ' ἣν ἐστάλη.** A

ἐστάλη· ἐκ δὲ ταύτης ὁρμώμενος ἀπόλλυται ὑπὸ Θρηίκων αὐτός τε ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης καὶ ὁ στρατὸς αὐτοῦ, πόλιν περικατήμενος καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Θρηίκων ὑποσπόνδων ἐξιέναι.

---

somewhat ironical expression sometimes. Cp. cc. 43, 45 *supra.*

6. **ἐκ δὲ ταύτης ὁρμώμενος**, as just above, c. 125.

7. **περικατήμενος καὶ βουλομένων.** The co-ordination is imperfect.

Thucydides 4. 102 apparently referring to this event informs us that Aristagoras endeavoured to effect a settlement upon the site where Amphipolis afterwards stood, then called Nine Ways (cp. 7. 114 *infra*), ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Ἠδώνων ἐξεκρούσθη. Thucydides supplies chronological data which seem to fix the event to the year 497 B.C. (cp. Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* ii.[3] pp. 317 ff.). This, according to our reconstruction of the chronology of the Ionian revolt (cp. Appendix V.), would place the failure, and death, of Aristagoras in Thrace, before the opening of the third campaign against the Ionians. How soon after his arrival in Thrace Aristagoras was disturbed by the Edonians is not stated, but the interval need not be supposed a long one. If Aristagoras left Miletos any time during the year 497 B.C., it might be in consequence of the successful operations against the cities cc. 116-117, or even after the great defeats on the Marsyas and at Labraunda (118-119). It might even be argued that he fled before the fleet went to Kypros (cp. c. 109 *supra*). He was gone presumably before the arrival of Histiaios at Sardes 6. 1. It is remarkable that Hdt. does not here name the πόλις attacked by Aristagoras, much less the subsequent attempts by the Athenians *circa* 465 B.C. and 436 B.C. to colonise it (cp. 9. 75, 6. 92 *infra*). Nor does he localise the city, nor name the Thracian tribe. This passage was presumably written after the first and probably after the second attempt, but it is possible that Hdt. did not identify the spot (cp. 7. 114). Hence too, perhaps, the precision of Thucydides.

ΕΡΑΤΩ

Ἀρισταγόρης μέν νυν Ἰωνίην ἀποστήσας οὕτω τελευτᾷ. 1
Ἱστιαῖος δὲ ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος μεμετιμένος ὑπὸ Δαρείου παρῆν
ἐς Σάρδις· ἀπιγμένον δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν Σούσων εἴρετο Ἀρτα-
φρένης ὁ Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος κατὰ κοῖόν τι δοκέοι Ἴωνας ἀπε-
στάναι. ὁ δὲ οὔτε εἰδέναι ἔφη ἐθώμαζέ τε τὸ γεγονός, ὡς οὐδὲν
δῆθεν τῶν παρεόντων πρηγμάτων ἐπιστάμενος. ὁ δὲ Ἀρτα-
φρένης ὁρέων αὐτὸν τεχνάζοντα εἶπε, εἰδὼς τὴν ἀτρεκείην τῆς
ἀποστάσιος, "οὕτω τοι Ἱστιαῖε ἔχει κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ πρήγματα·
τοῦτο τὸ ὑπόδημα ἔρραψας μὲν σύ, ὑπεδήσατο δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης."
Ἀρταφρένης μὲν ταῦτα ἐς τὴν ἀπόστασιν ἔχοντα εἶπε. Ἱστιαῖος 2
δὲ δείσας ὡς συνιέντα Ἀρταφρένεα ὑπὸ τὴν πρώτην ἐπελθοῦσαν
νύκτα ἀπέδρη ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, βασιλέα Δαρεῖον ἐξηπατηκώς· ὃς

---

1. 1. **Ἀρισταγόρης μέν.** This sentence might be the last of the fifth or the first of the sixth Book: cp. the passages from the seventh to the eighth, and from the eighth to the ninth. The division between the fifth and sixth Books is purely arbitrary: the narrative is absolutely continuous. However, it is characteristic of Herodotus to conclude a narrative, or gain a pause, by a biographical or anecdotal passage or appendix (cp. 4. 143 f., 205, 6. 137 ff., 9. 122): and from this point of view the divisions between Books 4 and 5, Books 5 and 6 are well devised. Cp. Introduction, § 2.

2. **Ἱστιαῖος δέ.** It might appear from the sequence of the sentences as if the death of Aristagoras preceded the return of Histiaios, but the tenses may partially correct that assumption (*τελευτᾷ . . παρῆν*, but some MSS. read *οὕτως ἐτελεύτα*): though the material considerations point to the conclusion that Aristagoras had evacuated Miletos before the reappearance of Histiaios: for (1) this conclusion suits the probable chronology, cp. 5. 124 and Appendix V.; (2) if Aristagoras had still been in Miletos, Histiaios would have gone to Miletos, rather than to Chios, cp. c. 5 *infra*. For the disregard of strict chronological sequence by Hdt., cp. the story of the death of Kleomenes c. 74 *infra*.

ὁ Μ. τύραννος. Aristagoras is ὁ *Μιλήσιος* 5. 124, or *ἐπίτροπος* 5. 106.

μεμετιμένος. Cp. 5. 108.

7. **ὁρέων αὐτὸν τεχνάζοντα.** Cp. 3. 130 *κατεφάνη τῷ Δαρείῳ τεχνάζειν ἐπιστάμενος.*

9. **τὸ ὑπόδημα.** Cp. the metaphors 5. 124. Hdt. calls this epigram the real truth about the revolt (*τὴν ἀτρεκείην τῆς ἀποστάσιος*): a different point of view is exhibited in the narrative 5. 28, 35, 98 where Aristagoras is protagonist, and the message of Histiaios a mere coincidence.

Σαρδὼ νῆσον τὴν μεγίστην ὑποδεξάμενος κατεργάσασθαι ὑπέδυνε τῶν Ἰώνων τὴν ἡγεμονίην τοῦ πρὸς Δαρεῖον πολέμου. διαβὰς δὲ ἐς Χίον ἐδέθη ὑπὸ Χίων, καταγνωσθεὶς πρὸς αὐτῶν νεώτερα πρήσσειν πρήγματα ἐς αὐτοὺς ἐκ Δαρείου. μαθόντες μέντοι οἱ Χῖοι τὸν πάντα λόγον, ὡς πολέμιος εἴη βασιλέι, ἔλυσαν αὐτόν.

3 ἐνθαῦτα δὴ εἰρωτώμενος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰώνων ὁ Ἱστιαῖος κατ' ὅ τι προθύμως οὕτω ἐπέστειλε τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ ἀπίστασθαι ἀπὸ βασιλέος καὶ κακὸν τοσοῦτον εἴη Ἴωνας ἐξεργασμένος, τὴν μὲν γενομένην αὐτοῖσι αἰτίην οὐ μάλα ἐξέφαινε, ὁ δὲ ἔλεγέ σφι ὡς βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος ἐβουλεύσατο Φοίνικας μὲν ἐξαναστήσας ἐν τῇ

2. 4. **Σαρδὼ νῆσον τὴν μεγίστην.** Cp. 5. 106 *supra*. Hdt. here speaks *propria persona*.

ὑπέδυνε, imperfect. He did not succeed in obtaining the direction of Ionia, though he had succeeded in deceiving (*ἐξηπατηκώς*) Dareios.

8. **τὸν πάντα λόγον.** Including probably the story of the man with the branded pate, cp. 5. 35. Cobet brackets *ὡς . . βασιλέι*. Whether Histiaios was playing a double game or not, or whether he changed his plans opportunely, may fairly be doubted. That he was released from Susa on the strength of his vow to add Sardinia to the empire is not probable (cp. 5. 106). That he came to recover the tyranny of Miletos rather than to head the rebellion against Dareios is at least possible. If Aristagoras (5. 124), if Hekataios (5. 36), if Dareios (5. 105), all counted on the collapse of the rebellion, is it reasonable to ascribe to Histiaios a less intelligent forecast? Distrusted and hampered by Artaphrenes, shut out of Miletos, suspected by the men of Chios, the great adventurer was equal to the occasion. If he knew the strength, he also perhaps knew the weakness of the empire better than most men: he may have been already counting on the king's death, and a palace revolution. The aspect of affairs in Ionia may have encouraged him. He claimed to be the real author of the national movement. He managed to reassure the Chians, or at least made good his escape from Chios, but he failed to secure the *hegemonia*. With his failure the last chance of sufficiently capable and authoritative leadership disappeared, and the separatist tendencies in Ionia gained upon the confederation.

3. 1. **ὑπὸ τ. Ἰ.** Perhaps the Federal council surely not merely the Chians, or the Milesians: or is it a periphrasis for 'Hekataios,' who had taken a gloomy view of the prospects of revolt from the first, 5. 36 *supra*?

3. **κακὸν τοσοῦτον.** The report of this inquiry is barely credible. Even Ionians would scarcely have described the struggle for freedom in such terms. The letter and spirit of the question are incompatible with the action of the Ionians throughout the struggle. They are rid of domestic tyrants, they are fighting gallantly, and so far not unsuccessfully for their freedom from the foreign yoke, and they reproach the man whom they acknowledge as the author of the movement, and who, *ex hypothesi*, is now prepared to head it, with injuring them! The obvious answer of Histiaios would have been: Nor I nor Aristagoras could have made you revolt from the king against your own will and judgment. The anecdote is evidently coloured by afterthought and knowledge of the event. Hdt. fully endorsed the shallow view that the Ionian revolt was a huge mistake, 5. 97, 98, 124.

τὴν μ. γ. αὐτ. αἰτίην. Hdt. has revealed it 5. 35. *αὐτοῖσι* with *ἐξέφαινε*. It is hardly likely that Histiaios betrayed it to any one.

5. **Δαρεῖος.** Suspectum nomen, van Herwerden, who leaves hardly a superfluous proper name in the text of Hdt. But cp. c. 13 *infra*.

ἐβουλεύσατο κτλ. This supposed intention illustrates well the secular rivalry and hostility between Ionian and Phoenician. For an analogous intention reported from another quarter, cp. 9. 106. The Ionians were felt to be a movable folk, cp. 1. 170. The anecdote may represent a genuine and constant scare: one which had perhaps contributed, and been used, to en-

Ἰωνίῃ κατοικίσαι, Ἴωνας δὲ ἐν τῇ Φοινίκῃ, καὶ τούτων εἵνεκα ἐπιστέλλειε. οὐδέν τι πάντως ταῦτα βασιλέος βουλευσαμένου ἐδειμάτου τοὺς Ἴωνας.

4 Μετὰ δὲ ὁ Ἱστιαῖος δι' ἀγγέλου ποιεύμενος Ἑρμίππου ἀνδρὸς Ἀταρνίτεω τοῖσι ἐν Σάρδισι ἐοῦσι Περσέων ἔπεμπε βυβλία, ὡς προλελεσχηνευμένων αὐτῷ ἀποστάσιος πέρι. ὁ δὲ Ἕρμιππος πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἀπεπέμφθη οὐ διδοῖ, φέρων δὲ ἐνεχείρισε τὰ βυβλία Ἀρταφρένεϊ· ὁ δὲ μαθὼν πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον ἐκέλευε τὸν Ἕρμιππον τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Ἱστιαίου δοῦναι φέροντα τοῖσί περ ἔφερε, τὰ δὲ ἀμοιβαῖα τὰ παρὰ τῶν Περσέων ἀντιπεμπόμενα Ἱστιαίῳ ἑωυτῷ δοῦναι. τούτων δὲ γενομένων φανερῶν ἀπέκτεινε ἐνθαῦτα πολλοὺς Περσέων ὁ Ἀρταφρένης.

Περὶ Σάρδις μὲν δὴ ἐγίνετο ταραχή. Ἱστιαῖον δὲ ταύτης 5 ἀποσφαλέντα τῆς ἐλπίδος Χῖοι κατῆγον ἐς Μίλητον, αὐτοῦ Ἱστιαίου δεηθέντος. οἱ δὲ Μιλήσιοι, ἄσμενοι ἀπαλλαχθέντες καὶ Ἀρισταγόρεω, οὐδαμῶς πρόθυμοι ἦσαν ἄλλον τύραννον δέκεσθαι ἐς τὴν χώρην, οἷα ἐλευθερίης γευσάμενοι. καὶ δὴ νυκτὸς γὰρ ἐούσης βίῃ ἐπειρᾶτο κατιὼν ὁ Ἱστιαῖος ἐς τὴν Μίλητον, τιτρώσκεται τὸν μηρὸν ὑπό τευ τῶν Μιλησίων. ὁ μὲν δὴ

---

courage the revolt in the first instance, and is here post-dated: or it might have been suggested not by Histiaios, or not by Histiaios alone, but by other distinguished exiles; cp. c. 9 *infra*.

7. **οὐδὲν κτλ.** Krüger pronounces the asyndeton intolerable (*unerträglich*), puts a comma before *οὐδὲν* and reads *δειματῶν*. Van Herwerden brackets *ἐδειμάτου τ.* Ἴ. (after Dobree).

4. 1. **μετὰ δὲ κτλ.** The chronological indication is slight, but the anecdote which follows, though obscure, has the very marks of historical fact about it, and indicates that there was an intrigue on foot in Sardes against Artaphrenes among some of the Persians with whom Histiaios was acting. The story may be of Chian origin: Atarneus belonging to Chios (1. 160), cp. c. 28 *infra*, but it can hardly be supposed that the correspondence (*τὰ βυβλία . . τὰ ἀμοιβαῖα*) in question was preserved, or ever passed under Hdt.'s eyes. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxvii.

3. **προλελεσχηνευμένων.** Cp. *λέσχη* 2. 32, 9. 71, *ἔλλεσχος* 1. 153, *περιλεσχήνευτος* 2. 135 all referring to talk, conversation (but not mere dialogue); cp. *λεσχηνεύειν*. The change to the genitive, after *ἐοῦσι*, is eased by the *ὡς*. Some MSS. (*β*) have the dative singular here.

5. 1. **ταύτης.** Hekataios was a man of many hopes (5. 35). But *ἐλπίς* is here used concretely of the thing hoped for (*ἀπόστασις* c. 4).

2. **κατῆγον**, imperfect: they did not succeed. Cp. *ὑπέδυνε* c. 2 *supra*, *ἔπειθε*, *ἔπεισε* just below.

3. **Ἱστιαίου**, deleted by van Herwerden. If this story be true, as it stands, it would imply that the Ionian confederacy was breaking down, old rivalries and jealousies asserting themselves within the league, Chian oligarchs ready to hand over Miletos to a tyrant, Aeolians of Lesbos ready to blackmail Ionians at the Bosporos. Such things may not be incredible, but it is also possible that the facts are misdated, or misrepresented, in these somewhat incoherent traditions. The Chians and Lesbians are in force at Lade, c. 8 *infra*. The Chians and Milesians were old friends, 1. 18, and both must have been represented at the next meeting at the Panionion c. 7 *infra*, yet no complaint is heard there, or at least, none is recorded.

5. **ἐλευθερίης γευσάμενοι.** The genitive is usual with *γεύεσθαι*. Cp. Kühner, *Ausf. Gram.*[2] § 417, 3 (p. 305).

7. **τευ τῶν.** Krüger suggests *τῶν τευ*.

ὡς ἄπωστὸς τῆς ἑωυτοῦ γίνεται, ἀπικνέεται ὀπίσω ἐς τὴν Χίον· ἐνθεῦτεν δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἔπειθε τοὺς Χίους ὥστε ἑωυτῷ δοῦναι νέας, διέβη ἐς Μυτιλήνην καὶ ἔπεισε Λεσβίους δοῦναί οἱ νέας. οἱ δὲ πληρώσαντες ὀκτὼ τριήρεας ἔπλεον ἅμα Ἱστιαίῳ ἐς Βυζάντιον, ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἱζόμενοι τὰς ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου ἐκπλεούσας τῶν νεῶν ἐλάμβανον, πλὴν ἢ ὅσοι αὐτῶν Ἱστιαίῳ ἔφασαν ἕτοιμοι εἶναι πείθεσθαι.

6 *Ἱστιαῖος μέν νυν καὶ Μυτιληναῖοι ἐποίευν ταῦτα. ἐπὶ δὲ Μίλητον αὐτὴν ναυτικὸς πολλὸς καὶ πεζὸς ἦν στρατὸς προσδόκιμος· συστραφέντες γὰρ οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Περσέων καὶ ἓν ποιήσαντες στρατόπεδον ἤλαυνον ἐπὶ τὴν Μίλητον, τἆλλα πολίσματα περὶ ἐλάσσονος ποιησάμενοι. τοῦ δὲ ναυτικοῦ Φοίνικες μὲν ἦσαν προθυμότατοι, συνεστρατεύοντο δὲ καὶ Κύπριοι νεωστὶ κατεστραμμένοι καὶ Κίλικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι.*

7 *οἱ μὲν δὴ ἐπὶ τὴν Μίλητον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἰωνίην ἐστρατεύοντο, Ἴωνες δὲ πυνθανόμενοι ταῦτα ἔπεμπον προβούλους σφέων αὐτῶν ἐς Πανιώνιον. ἀπικομένοισι δὲ τούτοισι ἐς τοῦτον τὸν χῶρον*

---

10. **δοῦναί οἱ νέας,** bracketed by van Herwerden.

11. **Βυζάντιον** had joined the revolt (497 B.C. spring), perhaps under pressure (5. 103), and may not have been very ardent in the cause (but cp. c. 33 *infra*): or Histiaios may have given himself out as on the Ionian side, or at any rate, against the king.

6. 1. **ἐποίευν,** imperfect. The story of Histiaios is resumed c. 26 *infra.*

3. **οἱ στρατηγοὶ τ. Π.** Of the three generals who had been originally entrusted with the task of quelling the revolt (5. 116) only Otanes was left. Perhaps Harpagos (c. 28 *infra*) and Artaphrenes the younger, or his father (5. 123), are now in the field. The disappearance of the names of the Persian generals and admirals at this point is noticeable.

6. **προθυμότατοι.** The Phoenicians had not merely two defeats to avenge (5. 99, 112), but the prospect of recovering their quondam position in the Aegaean, c. 3 *supra.*

7. **Κύπριοι.** It is possible that even Greek vessels fought on the Persian side at Lade, *e.g.* the men of Kurion, 5. 113. Cp. 7. 70. Phoenicians, Egyptians, Kyprians, Kilikians furnish the bulk of the navy of Xerxes afterwards, 7. 89 ff. The mobilisation of such a fleet is testimony to the magnitude and importance of the Ionian revolt.

νεωστὶ κ., 5. 116. In the year 496 B.C. probably. The date now reached is presumably just before the campaign of 494 B.C. which culminated at Lade. The great meeting at the Panionion may be dated in the winter 495-4 B.C. The earliest possible date for the reduction of the Kyprians would be in the winter of 497-6 B.C. The *νεωστὶ* here might almost persuade us to bring down the year of Kypriote freedom (5. 416) into the year 496-5 B.C. Cp. Appendix V.

7. 1. **ἐστρατεύοντο,** imperfect.

2. **πυνθανόμενοι.** Cp. 5. 118.

προβούλους, 7. 172. Stein takes *σφέων αὐτῶν* here, as Ἑλλάδος there, objectively.

3. **Πανιώνιον.** *τὸ δὲ Πανιώνιον ἐστὶ τῆς Μυκάλης χῶρος ἱρὸς πρὸς ἄρκτον τετραμμένος κοινῇ ἐξαραιρημένος ὑπὸ Ἰώνων Ποσειδέωνι Ἑλικωνίῳ. ἡ δὲ Μυκάλη ἐστὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ἄκρη πρὸς ζέφυρον ἄνεμον κατήκουσα Σάμῳ καταντίον, ἐς τὴν συλλεγόμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πολίων Ἴωνες ἄγεσκον ὁρτὴν τῇ ἔθεντο οὔνομα Πανιώνια,* 1. 148. The old religious focus was used for political and military purposes. This meeting of the Ionian representatives to devise a plan of operation was clearly not the first during the war: see 5.

καὶ βουλευομένοισι ἔδοξε πεζὸν μὲν στρατὸν μηδένα συλλέγειν ἀντίξοον Πέρσῃσι, ἀλλὰ τὰ τείχεα ῥύεσθαι αὐτοὺς Μιλησίους, τὸ δὲ ναυτικὸν πληροῦν ὑπολιπομένους μηδεμίαν τῶν νεῶν, πληρώσαντας δὲ συλλέγεσθαι τὴν ταχίστην ἐς Λάδην προναυμαχήσοντας τῆς Μιλήτου. ἡ δὲ Λάδη ἐστὶ νῆσος μικρὴ ἐπὶ τῇ πόλι τῇ Μιλησίων κειμένη. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πεπληρωμένῃσι 8
τῇσι νηυσὶ παρῆσαν οἱ Ἴωνες, σὺν δέ σφι καὶ Αἰολέων ὅσοι τὴν Λέσβον νέμονται. ἐτάσσοντο δὲ ὧδε. τὸ μὲν πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ

---

109. Probably from the beginning (5. 37, 38) *τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων* had been revived to deliberate periodically and direct the movement. This meeting, however, in the winter or spring of 495/4 B.C. was perhaps specially remembered, as the last, and that one at which the desperate resolution was taken, to abandon the struggle by land, and stake all upon another, a third, great naval engagement.

8. **νῆσος.** Lade was still an island in the time of Strabo, 635. The alluvial deposit has now converted it into a peninsula (cp. 2. 10). Lolling in I. Müller's *Handbuch*, iii. 256.

8. 2. **ὅσοι τὴν Λέσβον.** This is Stein's text, combined out of *ὅσοι τὴν αἰολίδα γῆν* ABCP[t] (= Holder α) and *οἱ Λέσβον* P[m]R (= Holder β). (The Aeolians of the Troad were already reduced 5. 122, 123.) But it would have been queer if the Lesbians had just previously sent eight ships to blackmail the Ionians at Byzantion c. 5 *supra*, and now sent seventy to the support of the Ionians at Lade. The Dorians are conspicuous by their absence: not a Rhodian vessel, not a vessel from Knidos, Halikarnassos or any Karian city! Of the members of the Ionian Dodekapolis eight are here present: what of the absentees? Ephesos seems to have taken little if any part in the revolt. Ephesians had acted as guides to Sardes 5. 100. Against that service may be set the massacre of the Chians c. 16 *infra*. Ephesos did not suffer by the revolt: she had had her share in the days of Kyros, when Miletos had got off scot-free, 1. 141. Klazomenae was apparently already in the hands of the Persians 5. 123. Lebedos and Kolophon may have shared the fate of Klazomenae, though Hdt. does not say so. In regard to the eight remaining: the exact specification of their contingents, and of the total, is remarkable. One would like to believe that Hdt. had some authentic information upon the subject, and was not merely basing an inference upon the maxima ascertained for the period of Athenian supremacy, in his own day. Samos had been swept and devastated less than twenty years before (3. 149), yet is now among the most flourishing. It is the former statement probably that is exaggerated. Chios sends 100 ships; Miletos, notwithstanding the necessity of defending the town (*τὰ τείχεα ῥύεσθαι αὐτοὺς Μιλησίους* c. 7), 80 ships; Lesbians (Aeolians) 70, but they were not present in full force, if eight ships were at Byzantion with Histiaios (c. 5); the Samians send 60. In their case there was the Record in the Agora, which Hdt. probably saw c. 14 *infra*, but it only vouched for 11 ships, and it can hardly have been inscribed and erected before Mykale, 479/8 B.C., when the oligarchy was restored. At the date of Lade, Athens *ex hypothesi* can only launch 50 triremes and yet holds her own with Aigina (cp. c. 89 *infra*). There is a great drop from Samos with its 60 to Teos with its 17 triremes, Priene with 12, and Erythrae with eight. Myus and Phokaia close the list with three apiece. The total is correctly stated as 353. The 600 given as the number of the 'barbarians' looks suspiciously like a round number. It is exactly the number of the fleet of Datis and Artaphrenes, c. 95 *infra*, and it is not distributed among the nations mentioned as supplying the fleet in c. 6. Even the contingents of Chios, Miletos, Lesbos, Samos, are suspiciously round and large, as compared with the navy lists for Artemision (8. 1) and Salamis (8. 43 ff., 82). The positions of the Hellenic allies are enumerated in a line running east and west. They have their front to the south, whence the Phoenicians are approaching.

εἶχον κέρας αὐτοὶ Μιλήσιοι, νέας παρεχόμενοι ὀγδώκοντα· εἴχοντο δὲ τούτων Πριηνέες δυώδεκα νηυσὶ καὶ Μυήσιοι τρισὶ νηυσί, Μυησίων δὲ Τήιοι εἴχοντο ἑπτακαίδεκα νηυσί, Τηίων δὲ εἴχοντο Χῖοι ἑκατὸν νηυσί· πρὸς δὲ τούτοισι Ἐρυθραῖοί τε ἐτάσσοντο καὶ Φωκαέες, Ἐρυθραῖοι μὲν ὀκτὼ νέας παρεχόμενοι, Φωκαέες δὲ τρεῖς· Φωκαέων δὲ εἴχοντο Λέσβιοι νηυσὶ ἑβδομήκοντα· τελευταῖοι δὲ ἐτάσσοντο ἔχοντες τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέρην κέρας Σάμιοι ἑξήκοντα νηυσί. πάντων δὲ τούτων ὁ σύμπας ἀριθμὸς

9 ἐγένετο τρεῖς καὶ πεντήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσιαι τριήρεες. αὗται μὲν Ἰώνων ἦσαν, τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων τὸ πλῆθος τῶν νεῶν ἦσαν ἑξακόσιαι. ὡς δὲ καὶ αὗται ἀπίκατο πρὸς τὴν Μιλησίην καὶ ὁ πεζός σφι ἅπας παρῆν, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Περσέων στρατηγοὶ πυθόμενοι τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰάδων νεῶν καταρρώδησαν μὴ οὐ δυνατοὶ γένωνται ὑπερβαλέσθαι, καὶ οὕτω οὔτε τὴν Μίλητον οἷοί τε ἔωσι ἐξελεῖν μὴ οὐκ ἐόντες ναυκράτορες, πρός τε Δαρείου κινδυνεύσωσι κακόν τι λαβεῖν. ταῦτα ἐπιλεγόμενοι, συλλέξαντες τῶν Ἰώνων τοὺς τυράννους, οἳ ὑπ' Ἀρισταγόρεω μὲν τοῦ Μιλησίου καταλυθέντες τῶν ἀρχέων ἔφευγον ἐς Μήδους, ἐτύγχανον δὲ τότε συστρατευόμενοι ἐπὶ τὴν Μίλητον, τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοὺς παρεόντας συγκαλέσαντες ἔλεγόν σφι τάδε. "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, νῦν τις ὑμέων εὖ ποιήσας φανήτω τὸν βασιλέος οἶκον· τοὺς γὰρ ἑωυτοῦ ἕκαστος ὑμέων πολιήτας πειράσθω ἀποσχίζων ἀπὸ τοῦ λοιποῦ συμμαχικοῦ. προϊσχόμενοι δὲ ἐπαγγείλασθε τάδε, ὡς πείσονταί τε ἄχαρι οὐδὲν διὰ τὴν ἀπόστασιν, οὐδέ σφι οὔτε τὰ ἱρὰ οὔτε τὰ ἴδια ἐμπεπρήσεται, οὐδὲ βιαιότερον ἕξουσι οὐδὲν ἢ πρότερον εἶχον. εἰ δὲ ταῦτα μὲν οὐ ποιήσουσι, οἱ δὲ πάντως διὰ

---

9. 3. **καὶ αὗται** (αἱ νέες), *sc.* barbarorum. **ἀπίκατο**, 3rd pers. pl. for ἀπικντο (ἀπίγμην pl.p. ἵκω, ἀφίκω, ἄφιγμαι), ἀπίκοντο, c. 10 *infra*, imperfect.

Μιλησίην, *sc.* γῆν.

ὁ πεζός. Cp. cc. 6 *supra*, 11 *infra*.

4. **οἱ Π. στρατηγοί.** The fleet was under Persian officers. Cp. 5. 32, 7. 97. Their apprehension was justified by their previous experiences off Kypros, and Pamphylia: and the remark goes to justify the revolt, as having had a reasonable prospect of success. Cp. 5. 36, 98, 105, 124, 6. 3 *supra*.

5. **μὴ οὐ-δυνατοὶ γένωνται**, cp. 4. 97, a construction not to be confounded with **μὴ-οὐκ ἐόντες ναυκράτορες** just below. Cp. Goodwin, *Gk. Moods and Tenses*, p. 200, *ed. maj.* § 818, Madvig, §§ 211, 296, Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* § 516. 5, and § 589 (ii. 767, 1037 f.). Weber, *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze*, p. 129, cites this passage as one of four in which the Homeric (*sic*) use of μὴ οὐ *in dem Befurchtungssatz* is revived by Hdt. But the καταρρώδησαν μὴ οὐ-δυνατοὶ γένωνται and (μὴ) οὐκ-οἷοί τε ἔωσι are, so to speak, as spurious examples of the idiomatic use of μὴ οὐ as the passage 9. 46 ἀρρωδέομεν μὴ ὑμῖν οὐκ-ἡδέες γένωνται οἱ λόγοι (also quoted by Weber). *Il.* 10. 39 shows no coalescence of μὴ οὐ, for δείδω μὴ τις would give a contrary sense to δείδω μὴ οὔ τις κτλ. Cp. c. 11 *infra*.

9. **ὑπ' Ἀρισταγόρεω**, 5. 37. Cp. c. 13 *infra*.

14. **πειράσθω ἀποσχίζων.** Cp. ἐπειρᾶτο κατιὼν c. 5 *supra*. (β) had ἀποσχίζειν.

18. **εἰ . . οὐ-ποιήσουσι . . (εἰ) ἐλεύσονται . . λέγετε.** Note the form of

μάχης ἐλεύσονται, τάδε ἤδη σφι λέγετε ἐπηρεάζοντες, τά πέρ
σφεας κατέξει, ὡς ἑσσωθέντες τῇ μάχῃ ἐξανδραποδιεῦνται, καὶ
ὥς σφεων τοὺς παῖδας ἐκτομίας ποιήσομεν, τὰς δὲ παρθένους
ἀνασπάστους ἐς Βάκτρα, καὶ ὡς τὴν χώρην ἄλλοισι παραδώ-
σομεν." οἱ μὲν δὴ ἔλεγον τάδε. τῶν δὲ Ἰώνων οἱ τύραννοι 10
διέπεμπον νυκτὸς ἕκαστος ἐς τοὺς ἑωυτοῦ ἐξαγγελλόμενος. οἱ δὲ
Ἴωνες, ἐς τοὺς καὶ ἀπίκοντο αὗται αἱ ἀγγελίαι, ἀγνωμοσύνῃ τε
διεχρέωντο καὶ οὐ προσίεντο τὴν προδοσίην· ἑωυτοῖσι δὲ ἕκαστοι
ἐδόκεον μούνοισι ταῦτα τοὺς Πέρσας ἐξαγγέλλεσθαι.
Ταῦτα μέν νυν ἰθέως ἀπικομένων ἐς τὴν Μίλητον τῶν 11
Περσέων ἐγίνετο· μετὰ δὲ τῶν Ἰώνων συλλεχθέντων ἐς τὴν
Λάδην ἐγίνοντο ἀγοραί, καὶ δή κού σφι καὶ ἄλλοι ἠγορόωντο,
ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ ὁ Φωκαεὺς στρατηγὸς Διονύσιος λέγων τάδε.

---

the conditional sentence; cp. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 50, 1, note 1 (p. 103), *ed. maj.* § 447.

22. **ἐς Βάκτρα.** Cp. 4. 204. Bactra, a city (Balkh), 9. 113; Arrian, *Anab.* 3. 29.

ἄλλοισι, *sc.* Φοίνιξι, cp. c. 3 *supra*.

10. 1. **ἔλεγον τάδε.** Hdt.'s statement is as precise as if he himself had heard the speech addressed by the anonymous Persian generals to the unspecified Greek tyrants at an interview obviously private. The story may come ultimately from Samian sources. Cp. c. 13 *infra*.

3. **ἀγνωμοσύνῃ.** The word is used with a 'dyslogistic' implication; it was a mental quality opposed to *σοφία* (2. 172) and akin to *σκαιότης* (7. 9), and rarely, if ever, productive of advantage to its possessor; cp. 4. 93, 9. 3, where it is the antecedent of defeat. Only in the case of the Aiginetan defection from Epidaurus did success attend it 5. 83, if success it could be called, to be successful thieves. Cp. Introduction, p. cvi.

4. **ἕκαστοι ἐδόκεον.** It may fairly be doubted whether this remark comes from any other than a single source; whether these first messages 'to all the states whose tyrants had been deposed by Aristagoras,' dictated in the *ipsissima verba* of the Persian strategi, are much more than an afterthought, to soften the conduct of the Samians recorded below, c. 13.

11. 1. **ἐς τὴν Μίλητον.** The fleet *ἀπίκατο πρὸς τὴν Μιλησίην* (c. 9 *supra*) not quite so close to the city.

From the opening sentence of this c. it might be thought that the offers were made by the Persian commanders before the muster of the Ionians at Lade. *ταῦτα μὲν ἰθέως . . μετὰ δὲ κτλ.*

3. **ἀγοραί**, on land. The meaning (*concio*) is evident from the context: the word is used differently, 7. 23. Cp. cc. 14, 58 *infra*. This popular way of conducting a campaign, by discussion, would be an object lesson and contrast to Athenian methods at the time when Hdt. is writing, and its results their justification. But what of the other strategi, of whom no account is made in this story? Cp. points in the story of Salamis, 8. 56, 59, 61, 64, 74, 78, on which this story may have been modelled. Cp. Introduction, p. lxvii.

4. **ὁ Φωκαεὺς στρατηγός.** Blakesley supposes that Dionysios was really an *ἄπολις ἀνὴρ* in command of the *exiles* of Phokaia, and so obnoxious to the taunt levelled at Themistokles before Salamis, 8. 61. This point, if it could be admitted, would be a gain to the striking parallel which Grote has drawn between Lade and Salamis (Pt. II. c. xxxv. vol. iii. pp. 510 ff. Cp. c. 12 *infra*). But the supposed abandonment of Phokaia happened half a century before Lade, and Dionysios and his three ships would have been rather past service by this time. The exiles of Phokaia have been already provided for in the west, 1. 163 ff. If Dionysios and his men were exiles, where were the Phokaians of the city? The reproach against him is not that he is homeless but that he commands the smallest contingent. A remnant of Phokaians had returned to the city, 1. 165. It

"ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πρήγματα, ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, ἢ εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἢ δούλοισι, καὶ τούτοισι ὡς δρηπέτῃσι· νῦν ὦν ὑμεῖς ἢν μὲν βούλησθε ταλαιπωρίας ἐνδέκεσθαι, τὸ παραχρῆμα μὲν πόνος ὑμῖν ἔσται, οἷοί τε δὲ ἔσεσθε ὑπερβαλόμενοι τοὺς ἐναντίους εἶναι ἐλεύθεροι· εἰ δὲ μαλακίῃ τε καὶ ἀταξίῃ διαχρήσεσθε, οὐδεμίαν ὑμέων ἔχω ἐλπίδα μὴ οὐ δώσειν ὑμέας δίκην βασιλέι τῆς ἀποστάσιος. ἀλλ' ἐμοί τε πείθεσθε καὶ ἐμοὶ ὑμέας αὐτοὺς ἐπιτρέψατε· καὶ ὑμῖν ἐγώ, θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων, ὑποδέκομαι ἢ οὐ συμμίξειν τοὺς πολεμίους ἢ συμμίσγοντας πολλὸν ἐλασσωθήσεσθαι."

12 *ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες οἱ Ἴωνες ἐπιτράπουσι σφέας αὐτοὺς τῷ Διονυσίῳ. ὁ δὲ ἀνάγων ἑκάστοτε ἐπὶ κέρας τὰς νέας, ὅκως τοῖσι ἐρέτῃσι χρήσαιτο διέκπλοον ποιεύμενος τῇσι νηυσὶ δι' ἀλληλέων καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβάτας ὁπλίσειε, τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρης τὰς νέας ἔχεσκε ἐπ' ἀγκυρέων, παρεῖχέ τε τοῖσι Ἴωσι πόνον δι' ἡμέρης. μέχρι μέν νυν ἡμερέων ἑπτὰ ἐπείθοντό τε καὶ ἐποίευν τὸ κελευόμενον· τῇ δὲ ἐπὶ ταύτῃσι οἱ Ἴωνες, οἷα ἀπαθέες ἐόντες πόνων τοιούτων τετρυμένοι τε ταλαιπωρίῃσί τε*

---

was an insignificant place at the time when Hdt. was writing, and its name counted, perhaps, for more in the west (cp. c. 17 *infra*) than in the east. Is Phokaia credited with only three ships, because that is the number which escaped to the west, c. 17 *infra*, or is there, perhaps, a connexion between the three Phokaian ships at Lade and the three Talents, at which Phokaia was assessed 454-446 B.C.? Cp. *C.I.A.* i. p. 227.

5. **ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς.** This proverbial expression is as old as Homer, *Il.* 10. 173. For **ἔχεται**, 'balanced,' *ἵστασθαι* seems more usual (cp. L. & S. *sub v.* *ξυρόν*), and van Herwerden would read *ἵσταται* here.

ἄνδρες, emphatic. Cp. 4. 1, Thuc. 4. 92, 1, 126, 1.

6. **δρηπέτῃσι.** Cp. 4. 142 *supra*.

8. **ὑπερβαλόμενοι,** cc. 9 *supra*, 13 *infra*.

10. **οὐδεμίαν . . μὴ οὐ δώσειν.** Cp. Goodwin, § 95, 2 note 1 (b) (p. 200), *ed. maj.* 815, and the reff. given c. 9, l. 3 *supra*.

ὑμέων, objective gen.; 'you give me no hope.'

12. **θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων.** The expression is put again into the mouth of Miltiades, c. 109 *infra*.

12. 2 f. **ἐπὶ κέρας, διέκπλοον π.** These expressions show a high state of naval tactics among the Ionians, from whom the Athenians apparently learned this manœuvre. Cp. Thuc. 1. 89, 3, 2. 83, 5 *et al.* Unless, indeed, the statement is an anachronism. The construction of the sentence **ὅκως ἐρέτῃσι χρήσαιτο κτλ.** is remarkable. Krüger approves of Schweighäuser's second thought *ut remiges exerceret* (cp. 5. 96 *ποιέων ἅπαντα ὅκως . . γενοίατο*, 5. 98 *ἐποίεε ὅκως β. Δ. λυπήσειε*). But the context and the material sense suggest the view that *ὅκως χρήσαιτο καὶ ὁπλίσειε* is practically co-ordinate with *ἔχεσκε παρεῖχέ τε*, the one sentence describing what took place the first part of the day, the other what took place *τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρης*. Schweighäuser's first thought *postquam remiges exercuisset* is not happily expressed, but comes nearer the sense. *Day by day he put out to sea, in column, keeping the oarsmen at work, as he made them perform the Diekplus, and keeping the Marines all the while under arms; and when the manœuvres were over, making the ships cast anchor and giving the Ionians no rest all day.* *τῇσι νηυσὶ δι' ἀλληλέων* could very well be spared: it makes the sentence top-heavy.

5. **ἐπ' ἀγκυρέων.** Instead of allowing the men to beach the vessels, and pass their time on shore.

6. **δι' ἡμέρης.** At night they were allowed to go ashore.

καὶ ἡλίῳ, ἔλεξαν πρὸς ἑωυτοὺς τάδε. "τίνα δαιμόνων παραβάντες τάδε ἀναπίμπλαμεν; οἵτινες παραφρονήσαντες καὶ ἐκπλώσαντες ἐκ τοῦ νόου ἀνδρὶ Φωκαέι ἀλαζόνι, παρεχομένῳ νέας τρεῖς, ἐπιτρέψαντες ἡμέας αὐτοὺς ἔχομεν· ὁ δὲ παραλαβὼν ἡμέας λυμαίνεται λύμῃσι ἀνηκέστοισι, καὶ δὴ πολλοὶ μὲν ἡμέων ἐς νούσους πεπτώκασι, πολλοὶ δὲ ἐπίδοξοι τὠυτὸ τοῦτο πείσεσθαί εἰσι, πρό τε τούτων τῶν κακῶν ἡμῖν γε κρέσσον καὶ ὅ τι ὦν ἄλλο παθεῖν ἐστι καὶ τὴν μέλλουσαν δουληίην ὑπομεῖναι ἥτις ἔσται, μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ παρεούσῃ συνέχεσθαι. φέρετε, τοῦ λοιποῦ μὴ πειθώμεθα αὐτοῦ." ταῦτα ἔλεξαν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτίκα πείθεσθαι οὐδεὶς ἤθελε, ἀλλ' οἷα στρατιὴ σκηνάς τε πηξάμενοι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἐσκιητροφέοντο καὶ ἐσβαίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλεσκον ἐς τὰς νέας οὐδ' ἀναπειρᾶσθαι.

Μαθόντες δὲ ταῦτα τὰ γινόμενα ἐκ τῶν Ἰώνων οἱ στρατηγοὶ 13

---

9. **παραβάντες** with accusative of person is unusual. The Ionians are too much excited to be quite grammatical. Cp. c. 13 *infra*.

10. **παραφρονήσαντες**. The word is used c. 75 *infra*, of the madness of Kleomenes, 3. 34 of Kambyses.

11. **ἐκπλώσαντες**. A striking and suitable metaphor in the mouths of Ionians; less so, perhaps, in the mouth of Dareios 3. 155. In its literal sense, it is constructed with an acc. 5. 103.

ἀλαζόνι. Properly wanderer, vagabond, *landlouper* (L. & S.). If Dionysios was not ἄπολις (*vide* note *supra*) he was the next thing to it.

21. **ἀναπειρᾶσθαι**. Cp. *διαπειρᾶσθαι* 5. 109, *ἀπόπειραν . . ποιεῖσθαι* 8. 9.

The Ionians were old sailors; their colonies studded the shores of the Mediterranean, Aegean, Pontos; they had memory of endless adventures, from Nile to Phasis, from Kypros to Tartessos. They had already in this war proved victorious once, and perhaps again, over the king's vessels. A few days after taking to their tents they engaged the Persians, and owed a defeat largely to treachery. They fought well at Salamis for the king, and at Mykale, on the Hellespont, in Egypt and Kypros afterwards against him. No doubt their discipline was in Hdt.'s days far inferior to that of the Athenians (cp. Thuc. 1. 99); that inferiority was vividly present to the minds of the—Athenians, who had left their kinsmen to fight their battle at Lade, and who afterwards justified their own usurpation on the ground of their superiority (cp. Thuc. 1. 75). The contrast which Grote (*l. c.*) elaborates, apropos of Lade, is consciously patent in the Herodotean tradition. The moral is already here, and Grote, in taking the tradition *au pied de la lettre*, has, so to speak, fallen into the trap which a philo-Athenian writer, or his sources, has laid for us. Insubordination (ἀταξίη) and *mollesse* (μαλακίη) (c. 11 *supra*), disease (νόσοι) and treachery (c. 13) may all have been present, and cooperated towards the result; but we should have more respect for the verisimilitude of the tradition in the former particulars, if the Samians, who in the next chapter are distinguished from 'the Ionians,' had not been the traitors. The Herodotean account of the conduct and collapse of the Ionians at Lade is at once a satire on the Ionians, and a justification of the Athenian supremacy, as necessary to keep them together, and to save them from Persia. Afterthought, and apparently even after-events, have been used in the building of the story. More than half a century after Lade the Samian secession shook the Athenian supremacy almost to its foundations. (Cp. Thuc. 1. 115-117, 8. 76, 4, Plutarch, *Perikles*, c. 28 *ad fin.*) The story of Lade is certainly in part from Samian sources (cp. c. 14 *infra*). Lesbos, Chios, and Miletos were arrayed upon the side of Athens, in 439 B.C. Byzantion joined Samos in the revolt.

13. 1. **οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Σαμίων** (cp. c. 14 *infra*) are here distinguished from 'the Ionians,' as though 'the Samians'

τῶν Σαμίων ἐνθαῦτα δὴ παρ' Αἰάκεος τοῦ Συλοσῶντος κείνους τοὺς πρότερον ἔπεμπε λόγους ὁ Αἰάκης κελευόντων τῶν Περσέων, δεόμενός σφεων ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν Ἰώνων συμμαχίην· οἱ Σάμιοι ὦν ὁρῶντες ἐοῦσαν ἅμα μὲν ἀταξίην πολλὴν ἐκ τῶν Ἰώνων ἐδέκοντο τοὺς λόγους, ἅμα δὲ κατεφαίνετό σφι εἶναι ἀδύνατα τὰ βασιλέος πρήγματα ὑπερβαλέσθαι, εὖ [δὲ] ἐπιστάμενοι ὡς εἰ καὶ τὸ παρεὸν ναυτικὸν ὑπερβαλοίατο [τὸν Δαρεῖον], ἄλλο σφι παρέσται πενταπλήσιον. προφάσιος ὦν ἐπιλαβόμενοι, ἐπείτε τάχιστα εἶδον τοὺς Ἴωνας οὐ βουλομένους εἶναι χρηστούς, ἐν κέρδεϊ ἐποιεῦντο περιποιῆσαι τά τε ἱρὰ τὰ σφέτερα καὶ τὰ ἴδια. ὁ δὲ Αἰάκης, παρ' ὅτευ τοὺς λόγους ἐδέκοντο οἱ Σάμιοι, παῖς μὲν ἦν Συλοσῶντος τοῦ Αἰάκεος, τύραννος δὲ ἐὼν Σάμου ὑπὸ τοῦ Μιλησίου Ἀρισταγόρεω ἀπεστέρητο τὴν ἀρχὴν κατά περ οἱ ἄλλοι τῆς Ἰωνίης τύραννοι.

14 Τότε ὦν ἐπεὶ ἐπέπλεον οἱ Φοίνικες, οἱ Ἴωνες ἀντανῆγον καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰς νέας ἐπὶ κέρας. ὡς δὲ καὶ ἀγχοῦ ἐγίνοντο καὶ συνέμισγον ἀλλήλοισι, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως συγγράψαι

---

were not to be reproached with *ἀταξίη* and *μαλακίη*. 'The Ionians' in fact are made responsible in the first instance for the treachery of 'the Samians.' The Samians like Aristagoras 5. 124 take the view that *ἀδύνατα τὰ βασιλέος πρήγματα* (=*βασιλέα Δαρεῖον l. c.*) *ὑπερβαλέσθαι*. Cp. 5. 36. It is observable that in this process of whitewashing 'the Samians' Hdt.'s grammar becomes decidedly involved, giving rise to corruptions of the text. Holder and van Herwerden follow Cobet in transferring *ἐδέκοντο τοὺς λόγους* so as to precede *κείνους* and in expunging *λόγους* after *ἔπεμπε*. Even so, the sentence remains incoherent. Cp. c. 25 *infra*.

3. **πρότερον**, c. 10 *supra*.

7. **δὲ** *secl.* Stein.

8. **πενταπλήσιον**, *i.e.* 3000. Even the navy of Xerxes numbers only 1207, 7. 89. **τὸν Δαρεῖον** *del.* Wesseling.

9. **προφάσιος**. Not always a mere 'excuse.' Cp. 4. 135 *supra*.

10. **χρηστούς**. Cp. 5. 109. For *οὐ βουλομένους* van Herwerden and Holder adopt *ἀρνευμένους*, the reading of RSV (=β).

11. **τὰ ἱρά**. Their treachery had a pious motive: and its reward, c. 25. Hence Hdt. could enumerate the Heraion among the glories of Samos in his own day, 3. 60.

11. **Αἰάκης**. Aiakes son of Syloson (4. 138) younger brother of Polykrates (3. 39) had been invested with the tyranny by grace of Dareios (3. 139-147). It was in connexion with his first establishment, presumably, that the proverb arose *ἕκητι Συλοσῶντος εὐρυχωρίη*. Cp. Rose, *Arist. Frag.* 574 (ed. 1886).

13. **ὑπὸ τοῦ Μιλησίου . . ἀπεστέρητο**. Cp. 5. 37, c. 9 *supra*. The constant specification of Aristagoras as 'the Milesian' would hardly have occurred in a Milesian source.

14. 2. **ἐπὶ κέρας**, *ex hypothesi*, intending to perform the *διέκπλοος*. The exercises under Dionysios (c. 12) were not without result. The first sentence of this c. is somewhat of a *non sequitur*. Even if *τότε ὦν* mean little more than 'well then' (*leitet zur Erzählung zurück* St.) the fact remains that the Ionians put to sea meaning business.

3. **οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως συγγράψαι**. Oddly enough, Hdt. had a similar difficulty about the battle of Salamis, cp. 8. 87. This confession and the reason for the inability (*ἀλλήλους γὰρ καταιτιῶνται*) are highly significant of the untrustworthy character of the Greek traditions, which differed widely in regard to the same events, according to the interests or partialities of the states, factions, and persons involved. It must not be concluded from the formulae here that Hdt. had only oral tradition to deal with. Grote (iii. 512) argues from "the

οἵτινες τῶν Ἰώνων ἐγίνοντο ἄνδρες κακοὶ ἢ ἀγαθοὶ ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίῃ ταύτῃ· ἀλλήλους γὰρ καταιτιῶνται. λέγονται δὲ Σάμιοι ἐνθαῦτα κατὰ τὰ συγκείμενα πρὸς τὸν Αἰάκεα ἀειράμενοι τὰ ἱστία ἀποπλῶσαι ἐκ τῆς τάξιος ἐς τὴν Σάμον, πλὴν ἕνδεκα νεῶν· τουτέων δὲ οἱ τριήραρχοι παρέμενον καὶ ἐναυμάχεον ἀνηκουστήσαντες τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι· καί σφι τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Σαμίων ἔδωκε διὰ τοῦτο τὸ πρῆγμα ἐν στήλῃ ἀναγραφῆναι πατρόθεν ὡς ἀνδράσι ἀγαθοῖσι γενομένοισι, καὶ ἔστι αὕτη ἡ στήλη ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ. ἰδόμενοι δὲ καὶ Λέσβιοι τοὺς προσεχέας φεύγοντας τὠυτὸ ἐποίευν τοῖσι Σαμίοισι· ὣς δὲ καὶ οἱ πλεῦνες τῶν Ἰώνων ἐποίευν τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα. τῶν δὲ παραμεινάντων ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίῃ περιέφθησαν τρηχύτατα Χῖοι ὡς ἀποδεικνύμενοί τε ἔργα λαμπρὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐθελοκακέοντες. παρείχοντο μὲν γάρ, ὥσπερ καὶ πρό-

---

dramatic liveliness" of the scene described cc. 11, 12 *supra*, that Hdt. is indebted for the description to Hekataios, "who was probably present "(??). Grote's argument is unsound; Hdt. is the prince of story-tellers. But it is not impossible that the recriminations of the Ionians may have found their way into manuscript before Hdt. dealt with them. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxxiv. f.

5. **λέγονται.** The majority, Chians, Milesians, Lesbians, probably agreed in saddling the Samians with the supreme act of treachery, and there was the further evidence of the στήλη (*infra*) and of the intact ἱρὰ c. 25 *infra*. Hdt. will not himself condemn the Samians.

6. **τὰ ἱστία.** They should have been using their oars, for the διέκπλοος (cp. διεκπλέοντες c. 15 *infra*).

8. **τριήραρχοι.** Doubtless eleven in all, one to each ship, commanders inferior to the στρατηγοί, whose number is unfortunately not stated, cp. c. 13 *supra*.

9. **τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Σαμίων.** This grace, and the erection of the *stele*, must surely date from days subsequent to the battle of Mykale, and the liberation of Samos, cp. 9. 90, 103, 106. The evidences for Lade were post-Salaminian. Hdt. presumably had seen this very stele, and it is to be regretted that he did not copy or report the inscription, which probably contained more than bare proper names and patronymics. The πρῆγμα may or may not have been set forth in the title (cp. 8. 82). The phrases τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Σαμίων and ὡς ἀνδράσι ἀγαθοῖσι γενομένοισι may be from the inscription.

11. **ἔστι αὕτη ἡ σ. ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ.** The words convey no clear indication of the date of composition, but they suggest one of Hdt.'s sources of knowledge, cp. Introduction, pp. lix, lxxxii.

12. **Λέσβιοι** were not Ionians (cp. c. 8 *supra*), and if they had been the first to betray the cause, the story might have been more consistent, cp. cc. 5, 13 *supra*, 31 *infra*.

15. 1. **τῶν δὲ παραμεινάντων κτλ.** This chapter seems to qualify the statement, just above, that the historian cannot record who behaved well in the action. The 100 Chian ships greatly distinguished themselves, and suffered proportionately. Forty-nine Samian and 70 Lesbian ships had quitted the battle. It is remarkable that nothing is said of the conduct of the 80 Milesian ships: presumably they fought, and the same may be assumed of the (three) ships of Phokaia. There remain only the contingents of Teos, Priene, Erythrae, and Myus, making 40 ships together. The ships of Priene were next those of Miletos: those of Teos and Erythrae east and west of the Chians. In short, it is certain that the 130 ships, or rather 119 originally (c. 8 *supra*) forming the west or right wing towards the high sea, and subsequently perhaps the head of the column (ἐπὶ κέρας c. 14 *supra*), sailed away, and this act was sufficient to explain the sequel without supposing that their shameful example was followed by 'a majority of the Ionians.'

2. **περιέφθησαν**, cp. 5. 1.

3. **πρότερον**, cp. c. 8 *supra*. These apologies for repetition within a short

τερον εἰρέθη, νέας ἑκατόν, καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἑκάστης αὐτέων ἄνδρας τεσσεράκοντα τῶν ἀστῶν λογάδας ἐπιβατεύοντας. ὁρέοντες δὲ τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν συμμάχων προδιδόντας οὐκ ἐδικαίευν γίνεσθαι τοῖσι κακοῖσι αὐτῶν ὅμοιοι, ἀλλὰ μετ᾽ ὀλίγων συμμάχων μεμουνωμένοι διεκπλέοντες ἐναυμάχεον, ἐς ὃ τῶν πολεμίων ἑλόντες νέας συχνὰς

16 ἀπέβαλον τῶν σφετερέων τὰς πλεῦνας. Χῖοι μὲν δὴ τῇσι λοιπῇσι τῶν νεῶν ἀποφεύγουσι ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν· ὅσοισι δὲ τῶν Χίων ἀδύνατοι ἦσαν αἱ νέες ὑπὸ τρωμάτων, οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἐδιώκοντο καταφυγγάνουσι πρὸς τὴν Μυκάλην. νέας μὲν δὴ αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ ἐποκείλαντες κατέλιπον, οἱ δὲ πεζῇ ἐκομίζοντο διὰ τῆς ἠπείρου. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐσέβαλον ἐς τὴν Ἐφεσίην κομιζόμενοι οἱ Χῖοι, νυκτός τε γὰρ ἀπίκατο ἐς αὐτὴν καὶ ἐόντων τῇσι γυναιξὶ αὐτόθι θεσμοφορίων, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι, οὔτε προακηκοότες ὡς εἶχε περὶ τῶν Χίων ἰδόντες τε στρατὸν ἐς τὴν χώρην ἐσβεβληκότα, πάγχυ σφέας καταδόξαντες εἶναι κλῶπας καὶ ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, ἐξεβοήθεον πανδημεὶ καὶ ἔκτεινον τοὺς Χίους.

17 Οὗτοι μὲν τοίνυν τοιαύτῃσι περιέπιπτον τύχῃσι· Διονύσιος

---

space might occur in passages intended to be heard at one reading: where similar phrases, referring backward or forward over several Books, occur, they imply that the author conceived his work on a large scale, and addressed to a reading public. Cp. 5. 36.

5. **ἐπιβατεύοντας.** Amounting to 4000 picked hoplites in all.

8. **διεκπλέοντες.** Notwithstanding the desertion of the Samians and Lesbians, who were heading the column, the remainder, headed by the Phokaians under Dionysios (cp. c. 8 *supra*), who were posted next, proceeded to put the manœuvre into operation. The story here omits the Phokaians, to concentrate attention on the Chians, who came behind the ships of Phokaia and Erythrae, and is perhaps from a Chian source. Some one (Ion ?) may even have written of the deeds and sufferings of the Chians (ὅσα ἔρξαν ἢ ἔπαθον ἀξιόχρεα ἀπηγήσιος) before Hdt. collected his anecdotes.

9. **τὰς πλεῦνας.** At least 51. But the vagueness indicates a weakness in the source.

16. 4. **Μυκάλην.** τῆς ἠπείρου ἄκρη πρὸς ζέφυρον ἄνεμον κατήκουσα Σάμῳ καταντίον, 1. 148, cp. 9. 97.

7. **ἀπίκατο,** pluperf., cp. c. 9 *supra*.

καὶ ἐόντων. Cp. 5. 126 *ad fin.* for the construction.

θεσμοφορίων. The *Thesmophoria* were an autumn Festival at Athens (A. Mommsen, *Heortologie*, p. 291), and presumably elsewhere. Accepting the mysterious story in the text as a chronological indication, we are supplied with an approximate season for the battle of Lade. Like Marathon, Salamis, Plataea-Mykale, it was a September fight. On the origin of the Thesmophoria cp. 2. 171. It was a 'Pelasgic' function. The Ephesians were remarkable for not celebrating the Ionian Apaturia, 1. 147. Hdt. supplies evidence of the celebration of the Thesmophoria in Aigina c. 91 *infra*, and in Attica, cp. 8. 96. Men were excluded, Aristoph. *Thesm.* 633. The celebration evidently took place at night, outside the city, and probably under the full moon.

8. **οἱ Ἐφέσιοι,** 'the men of Ephesos.' Their ignorance of what was going on at Lade and Miletos is curious, not to say incredible: but it may have served as an excuse afterwards, when this exploit was remembered against them.

9. **στρατόν.** It might amount to some 2000 hoplites, to say nothing of seamen. It is not likely that the men of Ephesos annihilated them. A parley or self-defence or flight was possible. Nor does ἔκτεινον imply that the butchery was wholesale.

δὲ ὁ Φωκαεὺς ἐπείτε ἔμαθε τῶν Ἰώνων τὰ πρήγματα διεφθαρμένα, νέας ἑλὼν τρεῖς τῶν πολεμίων ἀπέπλεε ἐς μὲν Φώκαιαν οὐκέτι, εὖ εἰδὼς ὡς ἀνδραποδιεῖται σὺν τῇ ἄλλῃ Ἰωνίῃ· ὁ δὲ ἰθέως ὡς εἶχε ἔπλεε ἐς Φοινίκην, γαύλους δὲ ἐνθαῦτα καταδύσας καὶ χρήματα λαβὼν πολλὰ ἔπλεε ἐς Σικελίην, ὁρμώμενος δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν ληιστὴς κατεστήκεε Ἑλλήνων μὲν οὐδενός, Καρχηδονίων δὲ καὶ Τυρσηνῶν.

18 Οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ἐπείτε τῇ ναυμαχίῃ ἐνίκων τοὺς Ἴωνας, τὴν Μίλητον πολιορκέοντες ἐκ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ ὑπορύσσοντες τὰ τείχεα καὶ παντοίας μηχανὰς προσφέροντες, αἱρέουσι κατ' ἄκρης ἕκτῳ ἔτεϊ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀποστάσιος τῆς Ἀρισταγόρεω καὶ ἠνδραποδίσαντο τὴν πόλιν, ὥστε συμπεσεῖν τὸ πάθος τῷ χρηστηρίῳ τῷ ἐς Μίλητον γενομένῳ.
19 χρεωμένοισι γὰρ Ἀργείοισι ἐν Δελφοῖσι περὶ σωτηρίης τῆς πόλιος τῆς σφετέρης ἐχρήσθη ἐπίκοινον χρηστήριον, τὸ μὲν ἐς αὐτοὺς τοὺς Ἀργείους φέρον,

---

17. 2. ἔμαθε . . τὰ πρήγματα διεφθαρμένα. Cp. c. 23 l. 9 *infra*, Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* § 482 (ii. p. 613), Goodwin, *Gk. M. and T.*, § 884, *ed. maj.*

3. **τρεῖς.** One apiece for the three ships he commanded; more could not be expected. Cp. c. 12 *supra*.

Φώκαιαν. He was not, strictly speaking, an *ἄπολις ἀνήρ*. Cp. c. 11 *supra*.

5. On **γαῦλοι**, see Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships*, p. 113. On the accent, Chandler, *Gk. Accentuation*[2], § 274.

6. **Σικελίην.** Hdt. may have owed his knowledge of the subsequent course of the bold buccaneer to western sources. Cp. c. 22 *infra*, Introduction, pp. xcix. f.

ὁρμώμενος, 5. 125, 126. Cp. c. 5 *supra* *ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἰζόμενοι*.

7. **λῃστεία** was a comparatively respectable occupation still (cp. Thuc. 1. 5): practised simply upon Carthaginians and Etruscans, it hardly amounted to more or less than a legitimate form of warfare, or privateering.

18. 1. ἐνίκων. Lade was the only naval engagement in which the 'Persians' ever defeated Hellenes, for the defeat in Egypt in 454 B.C. (Thuc. 1. 109 f.) was hardly a naval engagement, and the victory of Konon and the Phoenicians at Knidos in 394 B.C. (Xen. *Hell.* 4. 3), and the successful operations of Memnon in 333 B.C. (Arrian, *Anab.* 2. 1), obviously need not be reckoned. The defeat at Lade was due to treachery, and the treachery to the political and commercial rivalries which divided Greeks, Aeolian from Ionian, Samian from Chian, Milesian from Ephesian, and indeed Samian from Samian, and so forth. The moral of this battle was not lost upon the Athenians (c. 21 *infra*) nor upon their great men, Miltiades, or Themistokles (cp. 6. 109, 8. 62 *et al.*), and seems to have reacted upon the memory and records of events, cp. cc. 12, 14 *supra*.

2. **καὶ θαλάσσης.** Hitherto the siege operations had been conducted solely by land.

ὑπορύσσοντες. Cp. 4. 200, 5. 115. Miletos was a walled town, which was more, perhaps, than could be said for Athens. Cp. 5. 64, c. 105 *infra*.

3. **παντοίας μηχανὰς** implies a certain development of siege artillery; but the description is too general to be of much service to the history of warfare. Cp. 8. 52.

κατ' ἄκρης, Homeric. *ὤλετο πᾶσα κατ' ἄκρης Ἴλιος*, *Il.* 13. 772.

4. **ἕκτῳ ἔτεϊ.** Probably a trustworthy and most valuable datum for chronology. The exact point of the rebellion of Aristagoras seems fixed (5. 37) to the seizure of the Ionian tyrants on the fleet at Myus, just after the return from Naxos. But a good deal turns on the interpretation of 'the sixth year.' The whole question is discussed, and a chronological reconstruction suggested, in Appendix V.

5. **συμπεσεῖν,** coincide, agree with, 'fulfil.'

19. 3. ἐπίκοινον χρηστήριον. Unfortu-

τὴν δὲ παρενθήκην ἔχρησε ἐς Μιλησίους. τὸ μέν νυν ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους ἔχον, ἐπεὰν κατὰ τοῦτο γένωμαι τοῦ λόγου, τότε μνησθήσομαι· τὰ δὲ τοῖσι Μιλησίοισι οὐ παρεοῦσι ἔχρησε, ἔχει ὧδε·

καὶ τότε δή, Μίλητε κακῶν ἐπιμήχανε ἔργων,
πολλοῖσιν δεῖπνόν τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα γενήσῃ,
σαὶ δ' ἄλοχοι πολλοῖσι πόδας νίψουσι κομήταις,
νηοῦ δ' ἡμετέρου Διδύμοις ἄλλοισι μελήσει.

---

nately Hdt. does not date this oracle. Rawlinson's translation darkens obscurity by inserting "once on a time." The Argive portion of the Response was afterwards interpreted as referring to the war with Kleomenes (cp. c. 77 *infra*), and Stein apparently argues from the inquiry of the Argives *περὶ σωτηρίης* (cp. 5. 119) that the war with Kleomenes was in prospect: but the Argives had occasion for such inquiries both before and after the days of Kleomenes, and the divine warning was vague enough to be sure of fulfilment sometime. The excursus, or insertion on Miletos, is somewhat more definite, and might serve to fix a date for the Argive *Theoria*. Blakesley argues from *κακῶν ἐπιμήχανε ἔργων* that the oracle belongs to the time of Kroisos and Kyros, when Miletos made a separate treaty with Kyros of which Delphi would disapprove. This hypothesis credits Delphi with extraordinary foresight and considerable patriotism, or at least loyalty to Lydia. From another point of view it may be argued that the recognised fulfilment of the prophecy in the case of Miletos leads us to date the oracle shortly before or after the events of 494 B.C. The Delphic oracle already, perhaps, as afterwards certainly (cp. 7. 140), took the view attributed to Aristagoras (5. 124) and the Samians (c. 13 *supra*), that 'the king' was invincible. In any case the Delphians might regard Rebellion, if not Democracy, the assault on Naxos, the attempt to involve Sparta, or Alkmaionid Athens, in the struggle with Persia, the burning of the Metroon in Sardes (5. 102) as *pessimi exempli* (cp. 5. 97, 98). Or was the *κακῶν ἐπιμήχανος ἔργων* levelled at the Milesian Hekataios, a philosopher, who proposed to confiscate the treasures of Branchidae? 5. 36. Even if the *κακὰ* referred to the acts or inaction of Miletos in 546 B.C., or included it, the oracle need not be carried back so far as to refer the Argive Theoria to the days of Anaxandrides 1. 82 (when by the way the question was not about the safety of the city but about possession of Thyrea). It certainly must not be assumed that every utterance, which fairly figures the event, was a work of afterthought: nor does the oracle here given commit Delphi so deeply as to be beyond the resources of interpretation, whatever the event. But anyway the association of the destruction of Miletos in 494 B.C. with the war of Kleomenes against Argos, whether due to interpretation or to inspiration, or simply to later contamination, equally points to the conclusion that those two events were approximately synchronous, whatever the date or dates of the Argive Theoria and of Argivo-Milesian Response. Cp. Appendix VII.

5. **τοῦ λόγου.** ὁ λόγος here cannot mean 'the (sixth, or present) Book,' though the reference is to c. 77 *infra*: nor again, is it merely 'the particular story of Argos' (*κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον*). The word *λόγος* seems here used more vaguely of the whole story, or work. Cp. line 16 *infra* and Introduction, p. lxxv.

6. **οὐ παρεοῦσι ἔχρησε.** A remarkable display of animus. (Cp. *mutatis mutandis καὶ παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἄκλητος* Thuc. 1. 118, 3.)

ἔχει ὧδε. The text of the oracle is not above suspicion. Nauck suggested *ἐπιήρανε* for *ἐπιμήχανε*. Van Herwerden reads *ὄρνισιν* for *πολλοῖσιν*, a clear improvement.

9. **ἀγλαὰ δῶρα,** *Il.* 1. 213.

11. **Διδύμοις.** Branchidae 5. 36. Strabo, 634, relates that the temple was burnt by *Xerxes* and that the Branchidae delivered up the treasury to the king, two statements which look rather like alternatives. The Milesians afterwards proceeded to build an immense temple, which was never completed. Rawlinson

τότε δὴ ταῦτα τοὺς Μιλησίους κατελάμβανε, ὁκότε ἄνδρες μὲν οἱ πλεῦνες ἐκτείνοντο ὑπὸ τῶν Περσέων ἐόντων κομητέων, γυναῖκες δὲ καὶ τέκνα ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ ἐγίνοντο, ἱρὸν δὲ τὸ ἐν Διδύμοισι καὶ ὁ νηός τε καὶ τὸ χρηστήριον συληθέντα ἐνεπίμπρατο. τῶν δ' ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ τούτῳ χρημάτων πολλάκις μνήμην ἑτέρωθι τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην. *ἐνθεῦτεν οἱ ζωγρηθέντες τῶν Μιλησίων ἤγοντο ἐς Σοῦσα. βασιλεὺς δέ σφεας Δαρεῖος κακὸν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ποιήσας κατοίκισε ἐπὶ τῇ Ἐρυθρῇ καλεομένῃ θαλάσσῃ ἐν Ἄμπῃ πόλι, παρ' ἣν Τίγρης ποταμὸς παραρρέων ἐς θάλασσαν ἐξιεῖ. τῆς δὲ Μιλησίων χώρης αὐτοὶ μὲν οἱ Πέρσαι εἶχον τὰ περὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ πεδίον, τὰ δὲ ὑπεράκρια ἔδοσαν Καρσὶ Πηδασεῦσι ἐκτῆσθαι.*

---

remarks that "the statement of Strabo is of no [*sic*] weight against the clear testimony of Hdt." But Strabo knew the work of Hdt.: and Hdt. is not quite explicit about the date of the burning (*τότε δὴ . . ὁκότε*). The last line of the oracle contemplates not the destruction of the shrine but the transfer of the management. On the distinction between **ἱρὸν** and **νηὸς** cp. K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch*, ii.[2] § 19 (1858).

ἄλλοισι, (not other gods, but) 'other men.' This prophecy can hardly be said to have been fulfilled, and is none the less likely to be genuine on that account. Cp. 4. 178.

16. **πολλάκις**. Cp. 5. 36 *supra*, 1. 46, 92, 157, 159, 2. 159. **τοῦ λόγου** seems here to embrace the whole work: as just above. The remark could only be made in a work intended for readers. Cp. c. 15 *supra*.

20. 1. **οἱ ζωγρηθέντες τ. Μ.** A remnant, the majority of the male population having been already put to the sword, c. 19. On such transplantations cp. 4. 204 and c. 119 *infra*. But see line 5 below.

2. **ἄλλο**, 'further.'

3. **Ἐρυθρῇ** stands here for the Persian gulf, of the distinct existence of which Hdt. is ignorant. It includes, indeed, all the S. ocean, cp. 4. 37 *et al.*

Ἄμπῃ: supposed to be the Ampelone of Pliny, 6. 28, colonia Milesiorum.

4. **ἐς θάλασσαν ἐξιεῖ.** That the Tigris effected a juncture with the Euphrates before finding its way to the sea is a fact apparently unknown to Hdt., who here at least avoids any formula implying autopsy. Cp. c. 119 *infra*.

5. **τῆς δὲ Μιλησίων χώρης.** That the Greeks were wholly extirpated from Miletos seems an exaggeration. At the battle of Mykale the Persians employ 'the Milesians,' who are presumably Hellenes and not merely 'Karians of Pedasa,' to guard the passes, 9. 99, and these Milesians did their best for the cause of Hellas on that day (9. 104). But the greatness of Miletos was past. Samos is the leading spirit of the revolt from Xerxes (cp. 9. 90. But cp. 8. 132). The primacy of Ionia passes from the mainland to the island (cp. 5. 28). Under Athenian hegemony there was probably a revival in Miletos, but it was a tributary (paying, with Leros and Teichiussa, but 5 T. at the time of its quarrel with Samos, cp. Thuc. 1. 115, 2, *C. I. A.* i. p. 227) while the name of Samos never appears in the Tribute lists. (Kleruchs were not established in the island before 365 B.C. apparently. See Hicks, *Manual Gk. Inscr.* No. 90.)

αὐτοὶ μ. οἱ Π. The Persians probably garrisoned the Akropolis, and may have appropriated the Plain, but that they cultivated it themselves is not likely. The Hyperakria would be the sheep-runs, on which some at least of the celebrated 'Milesia vellera' were grown.

6. **Καρσὶ Πηδασεῦσι.** What the Karians of Pedasa had done to deserve such a reward does not appear. We last heard of them as cutting a Persian army to pieces, 5. 121, unless indeed it was other Karians who did this, while the men of Pedasa were on the Persian side.

21 Παθοῦσι δὲ ταῦτα Μιλησίοισι πρὸς Περσέων οὐκ ἀπέδοσαν τὴν ὁμοίην Συβαρῖται, οἳ Λᾶόν τε καὶ Σκίδρον οἴκεον τῆς πόλιος ἀπεστερημένοι. Συβάριος γὰρ ἁλούσης ὑπὸ Κροτωνιητέων Μιλήσιοι πάντες ἡβηδὸν ἀπεκείραντο τὰς κεφαλὰς καὶ πένθος μέγα προσεθήκαντο· πόλιες γὰρ αὗται μάλιστα δὴ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ἀλλήλῃσι ἐξεινώθησαν· οὐδὲν ὁμοίως καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν γὰρ δῆλον ἐποίησαν ὑπεραχθεσθέντες τῇ Μιλήτου ἁλώσι τῇ

---

21. 2. **τὴν ὁμοίην**, *sc.* χάριν.

Συβαρῖται, οἳ κτλ. Cp. 5. 44. The date of the destruction of Sybaris by Kroton is 510 B.C., as Duncker, vi.[6] 640, deduces from Diodorus, 11. 90 and 12. 10.

Λᾶόν τε καὶ Σκίδρον. Originally dependent colonies of Sybaris, which may have received the exiles (cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 400). Sybaris was on the gulf of Tarentum north of Kroton: Laos and Skidros across the mountains to the west, and on the 'Tyrrhene' sea. Their losses and the migration might have ruptured the commercial relations between the Sybarites and Miletos, and after 15 or 16 years it is, perhaps, not surprising that the old friendship had waned. What is remarkable is that Hdt. should point so sharp a contrast between the conduct of the Sybarites, and that of the Athenians. The passage may be an addition, due in part to western sources, a possibility rendered more probable by the asyndeton.

6. **ἐξεινώθησαν.** (On the formula *τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν* cp. Introduction, p. civ.) The great friendship between Sybaris and Miletos previous to 510 B.C. was doubtless largely based upon commercial interests and exchanges. How long the friendship had lasted, and whether it was embodied in legal form (*σύμβολα*) are open questions: it was probably not unconnected with the Chalkid-Eretrian war (cp. 5. 99) in which Kroton and Sybaris followed Samos and Miletos respectively (Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 456). Sybaris was in a position to mediate the traffic between Asia and Etruria, and to compete with the passage by the Straits, which was commanded by Chalkis and its 'friends.' As an entrepôt its advantages may be compared to those of Corinth. The wares of Asia were debarked at Sybaris and re-embarked at Laos. By this traffic Miletos, the greatest of the Ionian cities of the sixth and seventh centuries B.C. with something like a monopoly of the Black Sea traffic on the one side, and a large share of the trade with Egypt on the other, found an almost unlimited market for her exports. The Milesians might well put on mourning for the destruction of Sybaris. (See Lenormant, *La Grande-Grèce*, i. 247 ff. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 401, points out that Grote first noticed the importance of the overland route, cp. Grote, Pt. II. c. xxii. vol. iii. p. 208, a remarkable passage.) The revival of Sybaris under Athenian auspices, and probably from the plan of the Milesian architect Hippodamos (Grote iv. 507), is the more comprehensible from the connexion between Athens and Miletos. Imperial Athens claimed the heritage and exploited the traditions of the old Ionian centres of commerce, Miletos, Chalkis, Delos, and attempted to merge old rivalries in a higher union. The revival of Sybaris in particular was an idea that went back to Themistokles (cp. 8. 62, Plutarch, *Themist.* 32), though it was only realised by Perikles: not very successfully (cp. Diodor. 12. 10). Herodotus is here on his own ground. Cp. Introduction, *p. c.*

οὐδὲν ὁμοίως κτλ. The following passage Blakesley is ready to bebracket as spurious upon two grounds: (1) Strabo, quoting the anecdote, 635, gives Kallisthenes, not Hdt., as his authority. But the anecdote was a celebrated one, probably told as often before as after Strabo (see references in Rawlinson, *ad l.*), and Strabo is not careful to quote the very earliest authority. (2) The asyndeton—an asyndeton is not sufficient to justify obelising a passage in Hdt. Stein compares 1. 20; cp. c. 3 *supra*.

The passage may be a later insertion or part of an insertion from the author's own hand, but it is thoroughly Herodotean.

Μιλήτου ἅλωσιν. "Haud injuria dubitatum est Μιλήτου ἅλωσις utrum titulus fuerit dramatis an argumentum

τε ἄλλῃ πολλαχῇ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ποιήσαντι Φρυνίχῳ δρᾶμα Μιλήτου ἅλωσιν καὶ διδάξαντι ἐς δάκρυά τε ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον, καὶ ἐζημίωσάν μιν ὡς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκήια κακὰ χιλίῃσι δραχμῇσι, καὶ ἐπέταξαν μηδένα χρᾶσθαι τούτῳ τῷ δράματι.

Μίλητος μέν νυν Μιλησίων ἠρήμωτο. Σαμίων δὲ τοῖσί τι 22 ἔχουσι τὸ μὲν ἐς τοὺς Μήδους ἐκ τῶν στρατηγῶν τῶν σφετέρων ποιηθὲν οὐδαμῶς ἤρεσκε, ἐδόκεε δὲ μετὰ τὴν ναυμαχίην αὐτίκα βουλευομένοισι, πρὶν ἤ σφι ἐς τὴν χώρην ἀπικέσθαι τὸν τύραννον Αἰάκεα, ἐς ἀποικίην ἐκπλέειν μηδὲ μένοντας Μήδοισί τε καὶ Αἰάκεϊ δουλεύειν. Ζαγκλαῖοι γὰρ οἱ ἀπὸ Σικελίης τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦτον πέμποντες ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην ἀγγέλους ἐπεκαλέοντο τοὺς Ἴωνας ἐς Καλὴν ἀκτήν, βουλόμενοι αὐτόθι πόλιν κτίσαι

Περσῶν quem titulus Suidas v. Φρύνιχος commemorat" (Nauck, *Trag. Gr. Frag.* p. 558). The prohibition recorded by Hdt. is perhaps to blame for the fact that neither fragment nor argument of the drama has survived. The drama of Phrynichos was remarkable as taking its plot from contemporary history, a new departure in dramatic composition. It was not, however, as a violation of artistic canons, or precedents, that it gave offence to the Athenians. But was it simply as a memento of their own sorrows? Were the spectators who wept the same as the dikasts who punished? Was there nothing more in the affair than Hdt. records? The suggestions that the drama may have contained, or have been interpreted as, a reproach for the desertion of Miletos, and the Ionian cause, and that the οἰκήια κακὰ (cp. 7. 152 τὰ οἰκήια κακὰ . . αἴσχιστα πεποίηται) were not so much the woe and sufferings of Miletos as the error and shortcomings of Athens, are too plausible to be summarily dismissed (cp. Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* vii.[5] 88). There may have been politicians in Athens who regarded the retirement from Ionia as a blunder. Even if Themistokles was not Archon in 493 B.C., he was old enough to perceive the advantage of supporting the Ionians. On a later occasion he was choragus to Phrynichos, when the latter celebrated not the woe but the victory of Athens in the *Phoenissae* (cp. Clinton, *Fasti ad ann.* 476 B.C., Plutarch, *Themist.* 5). The trial and condemnation of Phrynichos, for his drama of 493 B.C., may have been a political move, or act of revenge, by the persons who were mainly responsible for the withdrawal of the Athenians, or the repeated refusals (5. 103) to continue the support of the movement against the Persians: though the withdrawal may have been at the time inevitable. Cp. notes *ad l. c.*

9. **διδάξαντι.** Technical term (cp. 1. 23) for teaching the actors and chorus, which was done, or superintended, by the author or composer (ποιήσαντι). Van Herwerden, however, remarks: ποιήσαντι et καὶ non agnoscit scriptor περὶ ὕψους c. 24.

10. **οἰκήια.** On the relationship between Athens and Miletos, cp. 5. 97 *supra.*

22. 1. **Μιλησίων**, see note on c. 20 line 5 *supra.* **ἠρήμωτο**, pl.p.

τοῖσί τι ἔχουσι. It was the Samian 'Have-nots' who approved of what had been done by the (democratic) Strategi: it was the oligarchs who had most to apprehend from a medising tyrant. See c. 14 *supra.* Van Herwerden reads σφίσι and brackets Αἰάκεα.

5. **Μήδοισί τε καὶ Αἰάκεϊ δουλεύειν.** A double, but closely-related servitude: cp. c. 5 *supra.* The 'Persians' in this story are become 'Medes,' a variant which suggests a change in the sources.

8. **Καλὴν ἀκτήν.** A Sikel foundation, Freeman, *Sicily*, i. 143. On this passage cp. Freeman, ii. 109 f., and on the importance of the place under Duketios, *i.e.* about 446 B.C., *ib.* p. 378. It is remarkable that Hdt. makes no mention of Duketios and his achievements. Freeman (after Holm) suggests that Dionysios (c. 17 *supra*) was at the bottom of this invitation. The Samians had long been friends with the Chalkidic Ionians, 5. 99. *Zankle* was a joint

Ἰώνων. ἡ δὲ Καλὴ αὕτη ἀκτὴ καλεομένη ἔστι μὲν Σικελῶν, πρὸς δὲ Τυρσηνίην τετραμμένη τῆς Σικελίης. τούτων ὦν ἐπικαλεομένων οἱ Σάμιοι μοῦνοι Ἰώνων ἐστάλησαν, σὺν δέ σφι Μιλησίων οἱ ἐκπεφευγότες· ἐν ᾧ τοιόνδε δή τι συνήνεικε γενέσθαι.

23 Σάμιοι γὰρ κομιζόμενοι ἐς Σικελίην ἐγίνοντο ἐν Λοκροῖσι τοῖσι Ἐπιζεφυρίοισι, καὶ Ζαγκλαῖοι αὐτοί τε καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Σκύθης, περικατέατο πόλιν τῶν Σικελῶν ἐξελεῖν βουλόμενοι. μαθὼν δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ῥηγίου τύραννος Ἀναξίλεως, τότε ἐὼν διάφορος τοῖσι Ζαγκλαίοισι, συμμίξας τοῖσι Σαμίοισι ἀναπείθει ὡς χρεὸν εἴη Καλὴν μὲν ἀκτήν, ἐπ᾽ ἣν ἔπλεον, ἐᾶν χαίρειν, τὴν δὲ Ζάγκλην σχεῖν ἐοῦσαν ἔρημον ἀνδρῶν. πειθομένων δὲ τῶν Σαμίων καὶ σχόντων τὴν Ζάγκλην, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Ζαγκλαῖοι, ὡς ἐπύθοντο ἐχομένην τὴν πόλιν ἑωυτῶν, ἐβοήθεον αὐτῇ καὶ ἐπεκαλέοντο Ἱπποκράτεα τὸν Γέλης τύραννον· ἦν γὰρ δή σφι οὗτος σύμμαχος. ἐπείτε δὲ αὐτοῖσι καὶ ὁ Ἱπποκράτης σὺν τῇ στρατιῇ ἧκε βοηθέων, Σκύθην μὲν τὸν μούναρχον τῶν Ζαγκλαίων ὡς ἀποβαλόντα τὴν πόλιν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης πεδήσας καὶ τὸν ἀδελφεὸν αὐτοῦ Πυθογένεα ἐς Ἴνυκα πόλιν ἀπέπεμψε, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς Ζαγκλαίους κοινολογησάμενος τοῖσι

settlement from Chalkis in Euboea, and Cumae in Campania, Thuc. 6. 4, 5. Thuc. 6. 5 says that Zankle was occupied *ὑπὸ Σαμίων καὶ ἄλλων Ἰώνων*. These 'other Ionians' are represented by *Μιλησίων οἱ ἐκπεφυγότες*.

9. **ἔστι μὲν Σικελῶν.** This remark holds good of the date at which Hdt. is writing, but might have been inserted into the story of the Samians by Hdt. himself: not, indeed, that the geographical indication is so precise as to justify us in supposing it the result of autopsy, but that the gloss-like and clumsy remark is just such an one as the author might intercalate, supposing him to have been westwards.

12. **ἐν ᾧ**, *sc. στόλῳ* (if any antecedent be required).

23. 1. **Λοκροῖσι τ. Ἐ.** Not elsewhere mentioned by Hdt. The epithet distinguishes the Italiote city from the *Ὀζόλαι* (8. 32) and the *Ὀπούντιοι* (7. 203).

3. **Σκύθης.** Why is Skythes called *βασιλεὺς* and *μούναρχος*, while Anaxilas and Hippokrates are *τύραννοι*, if not because Hdt. had this story from a source favourable to Skythes? See next chapter: and cp. 5. 109, 110. For the co-ordinate construction, cp. 4. 181.

4. **Ῥηγίου.** Rhegion, commanding the straits on the Italian side as Zankle on the Sicilian (cp. Thuc. 4. 24, 4), was reckoned a Chalkidic foundation. (The story in Strabo, 257.)

Ἀναξίλεως. In 7. 165, a passage avowedly drawn from a Sikeliote source, Anaxilas is given with his father's name (Kretines).

8. **ἀνδρῶν.** The women and children were of course therein; cp. 4. 1.

10. **Ἱπποκράτεα τ. Γέλης τ.** Hippokrates son of Pantareus succeeded his brother Kleandros, 7. 154.

Γέλη. Cp. Thuc. 6. 4, 3.

11. **σύμμαχος.** In 7. 154 Hippokrates appears as *δεσπότης* of Zankle, and he certainly treats Skythes as a dependent ally not as an equal. But perhaps the 'war' referred to in 7. 154 is the one described here.

14. *Pythogenes* is only memorable for this misfortune.

Ἴνυκα. At the other side and end of Sicily, within the sphere of Akragantine and Gelaean influence (cp. Freeman, *Sicily*, i. 118, App. v.). The form *Ἴνυξ* is implied in *Ἴνυκος* c. 24 *infra*, and guaranteed by Steph. Byz. *sub v.* for Hdt. The usual form is *Ἴνυκον*, which all the MSS. have here.

Σαμίοισι καὶ ὅρκους δοὺς καὶ δεξάμενος προέδωκε. μισθὸς δέ οἱ ἦν εἰρημένος ὅδε ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμίων, πάντων τῶν ἐπίπλων καὶ ἀνδραπόδων τὰ ἡμίσεα μεταλαβεῖν τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλι, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν πάντα Ἱπποκράτεα λαγχάνειν. τοὺς μὲν δὴ πλεῦνας τῶν Ζαγκλαίων αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ εἶχε δήσας, τοὺς δὲ κορυφαίους αὐτῶν τριηκοσίους ἔδωκε τοῖσι Σαμίοισι κατασφάξαι· οὐ μέντοι οἵ γε Σάμιοι ἐποίησαν ταῦτα. Σκύθης δὲ ὁ τῶν 24
Ζαγκλαίων μούναρχος ἐκ τῆς Ἴνυκος ἐκδιδρήσκει ἐς Ἱμέρην, ἐκ δὲ ταύτης παρῆν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην καὶ ἀνέβη παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον· καί μιν ἐνόμισε Δαρεῖος πάντων ἀνδρῶν δικαιότατον εἶναι, ὅσοι ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρ' ἑωυτὸν ἀνέβησαν. καὶ γὰρ παραιτησάμενος βασιλέα ἐς Σικελίην ἀπίκετο καὶ αὖτις ἐκ τῆς Σικελίης ὀπίσω παρὰ βασιλέα, ἐς ὃ γήραϊ μέγα ὄλβιος ἐὼν ἐτελεύτησε ἐν Πέρσῃσι. Σάμιοι δὲ ἀπαλλαχθέντες Μήδων ἀπονητὶ πόλιν καλλίστην Ζάγκλην περιεβεβλέατο.

16. **μισθὸς . . εἰρημένος.** Cp. Hesiod, *Op.* 368, L. & S. *sub v.* *ἐρέω*.

20. **ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ**, cp. c. 19 *supra*. Abicht takes *εἶχε* with these words.

21. **ἔδωκε . . κατασφάξαι.** Cp. *ἔδοσαν ἐκτῆσθαι* c. 20 *supra*, *οἰκῆσαι ἔδοσαν* c. 90 *infra*, *κτάνειν ἐμοί νιν ἔδοσαν* Eurip. *Troad.* 874, Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 97, *ed. maj.* 770 ff. Hippokrates takes the Zanklean majority to sell as slaves, and hands the aristocracy, 300 in number, over to the tender mercies of the Samians—who were themselves aristocrats, cp. c. 22 *supra*.

24. 2. **Ἱμέρην.** Himera a colony of Chalkidians from Zankle (Thuc. 6. 5, 1). Van Herwerden brackets *ὁ τ. Ζ. μούναρχος*.

3. **Ἀσίην.** Skythes may have found his way to Asia, and to Susa, in Carthaginian or Phoenician vessels. His conduct offered a marked contrast to that of Demokedes, 3. 135 ff. This obvious contrast is pointed by Aelian, *V. H.* 8. 17, who calls Skythes *Ἰνύκινος*, perhaps from a misunderstanding of this passage, an error which bred others (cp. Perizonius *ad l. c.*). But did Skythes perhaps receive the tyrannis in Kos from Dareios? 7. 164. If we are right in identifying (after K. O. Müller, *Dorier*, i.[2] 171) this Skythes with that, we see that *δικαιοσύνη* was hereditary in the family, Kadmos the son of Skythes giving several notable proofs of it, two of which are recorded by Hdt. *l. c.* Freeman's attempt to separate the persons (*Sicily*, ii. 109 n.[3]) is hardly satisfactory.

8. **πόλιν καλλίστην Ζάγκλην περιεβεβλέατο.** For the pl. cp. 5. 78. Van Herwerden brackets the proper name here. According to the story told 7. 164, Kadmos, son of Skythes, resigned the tyranny in Kos and went to Sicily, and there received a city from the Samians, to wit Zankle, the name of which was changed to Messene. (That Hdt. forgets in one place (here) what he had said in another (there) is not so very strange. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.) Thuc. 6. 4, 5 mentions the seizure of Zankle by the Samians described by Hdt., but adds that the Samians were shortly afterwards expelled by Anaxilas tyrant of Rhegion, who refounded the city with a mixed population and renamed it Messene in honour of his own original country. As may be conjectured, it was upon this occasion that Kadmos the son of Skythes took Zankle from the men of Samos: though Freeman (*Sicily*, ii. p. 112) unfortunately reads *μετὰ Σαμίων* instead of *παρὰ Σαμίων* in 7. 164, and makes Kadmos help the Samians to take Zankle from Skythes! Thucydides, who had good authority for his Sicilian *Archaeology*, by design or accident, corrects and supplements the hints in Hdt. who appears ignorant of the subsequent fate of the Samians, or else *εἰδὼς ἑκὼν παρέρχεται*, though he mentions incidentally the change of name. Pausanias 4. 23, 3 f. gives the fullest account of these proceedings, but unfortunately spoils it by dating them to the 29th Olympiad in connexion with the second Messenian

25 Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ναυμαχίην τὴν ὑπὲρ Μιλήτου γενομένην Φοίνικες κελευσάντων Περσέων κατῆγον ἐς Σάμον Αἰάκεα τὸν Συλοσῶντος ὡς πολλοῦ τε ἄξιον γενόμενόν σφισι καὶ μεγάλα κατεργασάμενον· καὶ Σαμίοισι μούνοισι τῶν ἀποστάντων ἀπὸ Δαρείου διὰ τὴν ἔκλειψιν τῶν νεῶν ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίῃ οὔτε ἡ πόλις οὔτε τὰ ἱρὰ ἐνεπρήσθη. Μιλήτου δὲ ἁλούσης αὐτίκα Καρίην ἔσχον οἱ Πέρσαι, τὰς μὲν ἐθελοντὴν τῶν πολίων ὑποκυψάσας, τὰς δὲ ἀνάγκῃ προσηγάγοντο.

26 Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἐγίνετο. Ἱστιαίῳ δὲ τῷ Μιλησίῳ ἐόντι περὶ Βυζάντιον καὶ συλλαμβάνοντι τὰς Ἰώνων ὁλκάδας ἐκπλεούσας ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου ἐξαγγέλλεται τὰ περὶ τὴν Μίλητον γενόμενα. τὰ μὲν δὴ περὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἔχοντα πρήγματα ἐπιτράπει Βισάλτῃ Ἀπολλοφάνεος παιδὶ Ἀβυδηνῷ, αὐτὸς δὲ ἔχων Λεσβίους ἐς Χίον ἔπλεε, καὶ Χίων φρουρῇ οὐ προσιεμένῃ

---

war. It is uncritical to say (with Rawlinson) that the narrative of Pausanias is "a mere misrepresentation of the events here narrated," for Hdt. neither here nor elsewhere narrates the expulsion of the Samians from Zankle by Anaxilas, which is attested by Thucydides, as also the change of name to Messene, which by Hdt. is associated not with Anaxilas, but with Kadmos. If Anaxilas had anything to say to the change of name, it must have taken place before his death in 476 B.C., but Freeman (Note on "Anaxilas and the naming of Messana": *Sicily*, vol. ii. pp. 484 ff.) suggests that Thucydides may be in error, and that the change of name may have been due to a body of Messenian exiles settled at Zankle after their expulsion from the Peloponnesos about 457 B.C. This hypothesis is quite consistent with Hdt.'s statements, but will require to be supplemented by the assumption that the Messenians were led by Kadmos, who must have laid down the tyranny at Kos at least a quarter of a century before.

25. 1. **ὑπὲρ Μιλήτου.** Cp. c. 7 *supra* *προναυμαχήσοντας τῆς Μιλήτου.*

3. **μεγάλα.** His success had *inter alia* reopened the Aegean and Hellespont to the Phoenicians, c. 28 *infra*. The evidence and strong tradition tend to saddle the Samians, and especially the Samian democracy, with the treachery at Lade, cp. c. 22 *supra*. Even so, it is difficult to avoid the suspicion of exaggeration in what follows (*μούνοισι κτλ.*). The sole salvation of Samos might seem to justify their conduct. The word **ἔκλειψις** is noticeable: it is active.

7. **ἔσχον.** Cp. c. 23 *supra* *τὴν δὲ Ζάγκλην σχεῖν.*

τὰς μὲν . . ὑποκυψάσας, τὰς δὲ . . προσηγάγοντο is not strictly grammatical; the general form of the sentence (*Καρίην ἔσχον*) seems to require *τὰς μὲν τῶν πολίων ὁμολογίῃ κτεώμενοι τὰς δὲ ἀνάγκῃ προσαγαγόμενοι*. The introduction of the adverb *ἐθελοντὴν* transfers the action for the moment to the side of the Karians and leads to the substitution of *ὑποκυψάσας* for *κτεώμενοι* (or some such word), but the subject of the main clause reasserting itself (*τὰς δέ*), the participial description of the action of the subject is raised, by a sort of logical compensation, to the dignity of a final verb (*προσηγάγοντο*). At the same time this grammatical incoherence seems to betray a psychological confusion; cp. c. 13 *supra*. Van Herwerden brackets *προσηγάγοντο*.

26. 2. **τὰς Ἰώνων.** Probably in the main Milesian, bringing food supplies. Cp. 7. 147 *πλοῖα ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου σιταγωγὰ διεκπλώοντα τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον.* **ὁλκάς**, cp. L. & S. *sub v.* and c. 17 *supra*. *Bisaltes*, son of Apollophanes, of Abydos, though an Asiatic (Greek), suggests, in his name, a Thracian connexion. *Βισαλτίη*, 7. 115.

6. **Λεσβίους.** The Aeolian Lesbians had deserted the Chians and Milesians at Lade, c. 14 *supra*. Under the Milesian adventurer they now reap their reward, in the temporary conquest (*καταστροφὴ* c. 27 *infra*) of Chios.

μιν συνέβαλε ἐν Κοίλοισι καλεομένοισι τῆς Χίης χώρης. τούτων τε δὴ ἐφόνευσε συχνούς, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Χίων, οἷα δὴ κεκακωμένων ἐκ τῆς ναυμαχίης, ὁ Ἱστιαῖος ἔχων τοὺς Λεσβίους ἐπεκράτησε, ἐκ Πολίχνης τῆς Χίων ὁρμώμενος. 27 *φιλέει δέ κως προσημαίνειν, εὖτ᾽ ἂν μέλλῃ μεγάλα κακὰ ἢ πόλι ἢ ἔθνεϊ ἔσεσθαι· καὶ γὰρ Χίοισι πρὸ τούτων σημήια μεγάλα ἐγένετο. τοῦτο μέν σφι πέμψασι ἐς Δελφοὺς χορὸν νεηνιέων ἑκατὸν δύο μοῦνοι τούτων ἀπενόστησαν, τοὺς δὲ ὀκτώ τε καὶ ἐνενήκοντα αὐτῶν λοιμὸς ὑπολαβὼν ἀπήνεικε· τοῦτο δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλι τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον χρόνον, ὀλίγον πρὸ τῆς ναυμαχίης, παισὶ γράμματα διδασκομένοισι ἐνέπεσε ἡ στέγη, ὥστε ἀπ᾽ ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι παίδων εἷς μοῦνος ἀπέφυγε. ταῦτα μέν σφι σημήια ὁ θεὸς*

---

10. **Πολίχνης.** The town of that name in the Troad (Steph. B. *sub v.* Demetrius of Skepsis apud Strabonem, 603, describes the place: *τειχῆρες χωρίον*, in the vale of the Aisepos, on the left of the stream, below Palaiskepsis) seems rather far off, to serve as a basis for operations against Chios, but it would doubtless have made an excellent bandits' nest, and the words *τῆς Χίων* do not prove that the Polichne here spoken of was in Chios (*τῆς Χίης χώρης*) but merely that it belonged to the Chians. From its position the Idaean citadel seems to command the short land-route from the Gulf of Adramytteion to the Propontis. If the Chians had a stronghold on that route the Lesbians might have been specially anxious to eradicate them. Now the Chians had been in occupation of Atarneus for upwards of fifty years, 1. 160. There may, of course, have been a Polichne in Chios; if so, this passage contains the only notice of it: its situation (as that of Kaukasa 5. 33, and that of 'the Hollows') remains undetermined. Cp. *Dict. Geogr.* i. p. 610.

27. 1. **φιλέει δέ κως προσημαίνειν.** The chapter is significant as an illustration of the popular theology of the age which Hdt. represents; cp. c. 98 *infra*. Under ordinary circumstances such 'signs' as are here recorded might rank as themselves disasters: but has Hdt. forgotten the great iniquity of the Chians (1. 160) that he here omits to point a moral? Cp. c. 91 *infra*. *φιλέει*, 7. 10, 9. 122 *et al.* *προσημαίνειν*, cp. 1. 45. The omission of the subject before the verb is remarkable.

4. **ἐς Δελφούς.** The connexion between Ionian Chios and Delphi is observable. A choros of 100 was a double choros, or perhaps two chori, 50 being the normal number for a dithyrambic (Dionysiac) choros (cp. *Dict. Antiq. s. v.* CHORUS): it was probably such a choros that wine-loving Dionysos-worshipping Chios sent to Delphi, and the sober god was not well pleased. Cp. 4. 79.

7. **γράμματα.** Cp. 5. 58. At the beginning of the fifth century there were public schools for boys, in which reading and writing were taught—perhaps for commercial purposes. But the Homeric poems would not have been neglected at Chios. The island is volcanic, and subject to earthquakes, and the disaster here recorded may have been due to a natural cause, or simply to bad building.

9. **ὁ θεός.** What god? The *λοιμὸς* might have come from Apollo (*Il.* 1. 44 ff. etc.): the earthquake from Poseidon (7. 129): Athene was a warden of Chios (1. 160). But most probably the god here intended is Zeus, if any name is to be given. A monotheistic, or monistic, *tendency* is visible in the work of Herodotus (cp. especially 3. 108, 8. 13 and c. 98 *infra*). Influences from two different sources may have contributed to augment it: (1) The *Persian* religion, so far as understood by the Greeks (cp. 1. 131, 7. 37) and even the Persian Monarchy (7. 56, 203). (2) The development of Greek science, and the search for one physical principle, as substance or cause of all things, which is characteristic of early Greek philosophy. (Cp. Zeller, *Die Entwickelung des Monotheismus bei den Griechen* in *Vorträge u. Abhandlungen*, 1875, and Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* (1892), pp. 119 ff.) This second influence would harmonise well enough with (3) the older notions of a

προέδεξε, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἡ ναυμαχίη ὑπολαβοῦσα ἐς γόνυ τὴν πόλιν ἔβαλε, ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίῃ ἐπεγένετο Ἱστιαῖος Λεσβίους ἄγων· κεκακωμένων δὲ τῶν Χίων, καταστροφὴν εὐπετέως αὐτῶν ἐποιήσατο.

28 *Ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁ Ἱστιαῖος ἐστρατεύετο ἐπὶ Θάσον ἄγων Ἰώνων καὶ Αἰολέων συχνούς. περικατημένῳ δέ οἱ Θάσον ἦλθε ἀγγελίη ὡς οἱ Φοίνικες ἀναπλέουσι ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου ἐπὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἰωνίην. πυθόμενος δὲ ταῦτα Θάσον μὲν ἀπόρθητον λείπει, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐς τὴν Λέσβον ἠπείγετο ἄγων πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιήν. ἐκ Λέσβου δὲ λιμαινούσης οἱ τῆς στρατιῆς πέρην διαβαίνει, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀταρνέος ὡς ἀμήσων τὸν σῖτον τόν τε ἐνθεῦτεν καὶ τὸν ἐκ Καΐκου πεδίου τὸν τῶν Μυσῶν. ἐν δὲ τούτοισι τοῖσι χωρίοισι ἐτύγχανε ἐὼν Ἅρπαγος ἀνὴρ Πέρσης στρατηγὸς στρατιῆς οὐκ ὀλίγης· ὅς οἱ ἀποβάντι συμβαλὼν αὐτόν τε Ἱστιαῖον ζωγρίῃ ἔλαβε καὶ τὸν*
29 *στρατὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν πλέω διέφθειρε. ἐζωγρήθη δὲ ὁ Ἱστιαῖος*
ὧδε. ὡς ἐμάχοντο οἱ Ἕλληνες τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ἐν τῇ Μαλήνῃ

---

singular and fatal power behind the many gods (cp. 1. 91), which perhaps underlies the Herodotean (or popular) expressions *χρῆν*, *ἔδεε*, *θείῃ τύχῃ* and so on. Cp. Introduction, pp. cxii. ff.

10. **ἐς γόνυ.** A metaphor from wrestling, suggested, perhaps, by *ὑπολαβοῦσα*, which need not be identical in sense with *ὑπολαβὼν* just above.

28. 1. **Θάσον.** Rawlinson points out that the gold mines may have been the attraction, c. 46 *infra*, 2. 44. On the chronology, see Appendix VI. § 4.

Ἰώνων καὶ Αἰολέων συχνούς. Ionians he had got from some of the vessels passing through the Bosporos (c. 5 *supra*). The Lesbians were, of course, Aeolians (c. 8 *supra*). Other Ionian and Aeolian adventurers may have swelled his forces. Hdt. implies pretty plainly that *Dorians* he had none.

6. **Ἀταρνέος.** *χῶρος τῆς Μυσίης Λέσβου ἀντίος*, 1. 160. The topography of the region is more fully implied 7. 42. For the richness of the Kaikos valley, in which the Attalid residence Pergamon was afterwards situated, cp. Strabo, 624 *ad fin.*

7. **τὸν σῖτον.** The early harvest of 493 B.C.

9. **Ἅρπαγος.** The sudden appearance of Harpagos, a Persian, in command of a large force in Aeolis is remarkable: not less remarkable, seeing that Harpagos the *Mede* had made himself a name in the same district half a century before, cp. 1. 162, 169. The operations and their issue may have been connected with the events described in c. 4 *supra*. Histiaios was playing, or was credited with playing, a double game. A favourite with the king, he was not a favourite with the king's right-hand men, a Megabazos (5. 23), an Artaphrenes (6. 1 *et al.*). Histiaios was prepared to serve in Susa if he might reign in Ionia. He preferred to do the king's work with "plenty of Aeolians and Ionians," rather than see it done by the Phoenicians and by the Viceroy at Sardes. Satraps and Persian generals were not always subservient to the wishes of the king. Histiaios might plot and perpetrate acts of hostility against the local authorities, and yet trust to making all good in the eyes of the central government. He may very well have brought many of the maritime states round to his views by using the Phoenician scare (c. 3 *supra*). The Median and Persian grandees preferred the Phoenician interest, and were jealous of the great Greek tyrants.

29. 2. **Μαλήνῃ.** The reading is doubtful, and the spot unknown, though Kiepert's map places it conjecturally on the Evenos, west of the Kaikos. Wesseling conjectured *Καρίνῃ* or *Καρήνῃ* from 7. 42: but Rawlinson's note may be thought to dispose of that. There was a place, at least in later times, on the coast, on the borders of Pergamos, called Perperine (cp. Ramsay, *Asia Minor*, pp. 13, 117). One MS. reads *Μεγαλήνῃ*,

τῆς Ἀταρνείτιδος χώρης, οἱ μὲν συνέστασαν χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν, ἡ δὲ ἵππος ὕστερον ὁρμηθεῖσα ἐπιπίπτει τοῖσι Ἕλλησι. τό τε δὴ ἔργον τῆς ἵππου τοῦτο ἐγένετο, καὶ τετραμμένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁ Ἱστιαῖος ἐλπίζων οὐκ ἀπολέεσθαι ὑπὸ βασιλέος διὰ τὴν παρεοῦσαν ἁμαρτάδα φιλοψυχίην τοιήνδε τινὰ ἀναιρέεται· ὡς φεύγων τε κατελαμβάνετο ὑπὸ ἀνδρὸς Πέρσεω καὶ ὡς καταιρεόμενος ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔμελλε συγκεντηθήσεσθαι, Περσίδα γλῶσσαν μετεὶς καταμηνύει ἑωυτὸν ὡς εἴη Ἱστιαῖος ὁ Μιλήσιος. 30 εἰ μέν νυν, ὡς ἐζωγρήθη, ἄχθη ἀγόμενος παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον, ὁ δὲ οὔτ᾽ ἂν ἔπαθε κακὸν οὐδὲν δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἀπῆκέ τ᾽ ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίην· νῦν δέ μιν αὐτῶν τε τούτων εἵνεκα καὶ ἵνα μὴ διαφυγὼν αὖτις μέγας παρὰ βασιλέι γένηται, Ἀρταφρένης τε ὁ Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος καὶ ὁ λαβὼν Ἅρπαγος, ὡς ἀπίκετο ἀγόμενος ἐς Σάρδις, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ ἀνεσταύρωσαν, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ταριχεύσαντες ἀνήνεικαν παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον ἐς Σοῦσα. Δαρεῖος δὲ πυθόμενος ταῦτα καὶ ἐπαιτιησάμενος τοὺς ταῦτα ποιήσαντας ὅτι μιν οὐ ζώοντα ἀνήγαγον ἐς ὄψιν τὴν ἑωυτοῦ, τὴν κεφαλὴν τὴν Ἱστιαίου λούσαντάς τε καὶ περιστείλαντας εὖ ἐνετείλατο θάψαι ὡς ἀνδρὸς μεγάλως ἑωυτῷ τε καὶ Πέρσῃσι εὐεργέτεω.

Τὰ μὲν περὶ Ἱστιαῖον οὕτω ἔσχε. 31 ὁ δὲ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς ὁ Περσέων χειμερίσας περὶ Μίλητον, τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτεϊ ὡς ἀνέ-

two Μαλίνῃ. Might Περπερήνῃ be the true reading? (Strabo, 607, has Περπερηνή. Pliny 5. 32, nunc est Perperene civitas. The name may have been there long before the *civitas*.)

3. **χρόνον ἐπὶ πολλόν.** This is more or less a formula, cp. 5. 119, c. 113 *infra*.

5. **ἔργον.** *νῦν ἡμέτερον ἔργον*, 5. 1 *supra*.

7. **φιλοψυχίην . . ἀναιρέεται**, 'accepts as one's own,' 'entertain' (L. & S. *sub v.* B. II. 2. with reff.), "takes to himself." Contr. Ὀλύμπια, *νίκην ἀναιρέεσθαι*, cc. 36, 70, 103 *infra*.

30. 2. **ὁ δέ.** *δὲ in apodosi*. Just below (ἀπῆκε) the change of subject is obvious, rather than grammatical. Hdt. is apparently excited by having a theory of his own (*δοκέειν ἐμοί*) to propound. Cp. notes cc. 12, 25 *supra*.

6. **ὁ λαβών**, 'his captor.'

7. **ἀνεσταύρωσαν.** Having first apparently beheaded him, or at least put him to death somehow. The rapidity and suddenness with which Histiaios is bisected in the narrative is grimly humorous. There is an anacoluthon *μιν· τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*.

8. **ταριχεύσαντες.** See 2. 87.

The actives (*ἀνεσταύρωσαν κτλ.*) do not prove that Harpagos and Artaphrenes were themselves the immediate agents. The care with which 'Benefactors' (cp. c. 9 *supra*, 5. 11) were treated by the Persian king, is best illustrated in the story of Sandokes and Dareios, 7. 194.

12. **θάψαι.** The command comes suspiciously from the devout worshipper of Ormuzd. Though Hdt. asserts that it was a Persian practice to bury persons alive (7. 114), he is apparently not aware of the Persian objection to the burial of the dead (cp. 1. 140, 7. 100). But Dareios was tolerant of the religions of his various subjects, and may have directed that the remains of a Greek should be disposed of in accordance with the Greek rite: or the stricter canon of Masdaism may have been still in embryo. Cp. Perrot and Chipiez, *Art in Persia*, pp. 190 ff. (E. T. 1892).

31. 2. **χειμερίσας.** Winter 494-3 B.C.

πλωσε, αἱρέει εὐπετέως τὰς νήσους τὰς πρὸς τῇ ἠπείρῳ κειμένας, Χίον καὶ Λέσβον καὶ Τένεδον. ὅκως δὲ λάβοι τινὰ τῶν νήσων, ὡς ἑκάστην αἱρέοντες οἱ βάρβαροι ἐσαγήνευον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. σαγηνεύουσι δὲ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον· ἀνὴρ ἀνδρὸς ἁψάμενος τῆς χειρὸς ἐκ θαλάσσης τῆς βορηίης ἐπὶ τὴν νοτίην διήκουσι, καὶ ἔπειτα διὰ πάσης τῆς νήσου διέρχονται ἐκθηρεύοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. αἵρεον δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ πόλιας τὰς Ἰάδας κατὰ ταὐτά, πλὴν οὐκ ἐσαγήνευον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· οὐ γὰρ οἷά τ'
32 ἦν. ἐνθαῦτα Περσέων οἱ στρατηγοὶ οὐκ ἐψεύσαντο τὰς ἀπειλὰς τὰς ἐπηπείλησαν τοῖσι Ἴωσι στρατοπεδευομένοισι ἐναντία σφίσι. ὡς γὰρ δὴ ἐπεκράτησαν τῶν πολίων, παῖδάς τε τοὺς εὐειδεστάτους ἐκλεγόμενοι ἐξέταμνον καὶ ἐποίευν ἀντὶ εἶναι ἐνόρχιας εὐνούχους καὶ παρθένους τὰς καλλιστευούσας ἀνασπάστους παρὰ βασιλέα· ταῦτά τε δὴ ἐποίευν καὶ τὰς πόλιας ἐνεπίμπρασαν αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἱροῖσι. οὕτω τε τὸ τρίτον Ἴωνες κατεδουλώθησαν, πρῶτον μὲν ὑπὸ Λυδῶν, δὶς δὲ ἐπεξῆς τότε ὑπὸ Περσέων.

The story of the end of Histiaios has anticipated the strict chronological sequence. The date is to be concluded *a parte post.*: the ἔτος below, c. 42, is certainly 493 B.C. as calculated backwards from Marathon: and there is no change of year between cc. 31 and 42. Cp. Appendix VI.

τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτεϊ. The spring of 493 B.C. (cp. c. 28 *supra*).

3. **εὐπετέως.** Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos taken 'without serious resistance.' After Lade, Chios lacked the power, and Lesbos the will to resist.

5. **ἐσαγήνευον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους**, 'the inhabitants' without regard to sex or age. Cp. c. 23 *supra*. This statement is highly questionable. Why should Lesbos have been 'netted' after the medism at Lade? The clumsiness of the grammar even suggests that we have here the misapplication of a general rule, or hypothesis, not a genuine tradition of the particular cases in question. Van Herwerden, indeed, brackets ὅκως δὲ λάβοι τινὰ τῶν νήσων and reads ὡς δ' ἑκάστην κτλ. but cp. the similar construction, or want of construction, c. 12 *supra*. There are material objections to the statement. Stein, by no means given to picking holes in Hdt., remarks that, impossible as it might have been to apply the *Sagene* in Ionia, it would have been still more impossible to apply it "on the islands of the Aegean with their masses of mountains and multitudes of clefts" (*gebirgigen und schluchtenreichen Inseln*). This description in fact is perhaps one of the (Samian) exaggerations, of which there are several in Hdt. Cp. 3. 149, where Stein has unfortunately bracketed the word σαγηνεύσαντες. That the σαγήνη should be described here, after having been taken for granted there, cannot prove that this passage was composed by the historian earlier than that, for—to say nothing of the writer's capacity or caprice—such inconsequences may arise from the nature of the sources, or from differences in the public, or audience (a Western audience would require to have the *Sagene* explained).

32. 1. **οἱ στρατηγοί.** Unfortunately anonymous. Possibly Harpagos (c. 30), Artaphrenes and Otanes (5. 123) may be included.

τὰς ἀπειλάς, c. 9 *supra*. The record of the threats might be based upon an inference from the acts here recorded.

5. **τὰς καλλιστευούσας.** Chios has always been celebrated for the beauty of its women. Its fate on this occasion anticipated its sufferings in 1822 (Finlay, *History of Greece* (ed. Tozer), vi. 250-6).

8. **ὑπὸ Λυδῶν**, cp. 1. 26. The Islanders, however, had not been conquered by Kroisos, 1. 27. Nor is it certain that they were included in the first conquest of Ionia by the Persians, Kyros having no fleet, 1. 143. The

Ἀπὸ δὲ Ἰωνίης ἀπαλλασσόμενος ὁ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς τὰ ἐπ' 33
ἀριστερὰ ἐσπλέοντι τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου αἵρεε πάντα· τὰ γὰρ ἐπὶ δεξιὰ αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ὑποχείρια ἦν γεγονότα κατ' ἤπειρον. εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ αἵδε τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου, Χερσόνησός τε, ἐν τῇ πόλιες συχναὶ ἔνεισι, καὶ Πέρινθος καὶ τὰ τείχεα τὰ ἐπὶ Θρηίκης καὶ Σηλυμβρίη τε καὶ Βυζάντιον. Βυζάντιοι μέν νυν καὶ οἱ πέρηθε Καλχηδόνιοι οὐδ' ὑπέμειναν ἐπιπλέοντας τοὺς Φοίνικας, ἀλλ' οἴχοντο ἀπολιπόντες τὴν σφετέρην ἔσω ἐς τὸν Εὔξεινον πόντον, καὶ ἐνθαῦτα πόλιν Μεσαμβρίην οἴκησαν. οἱ δὲ Φοίνικες κατακαύσαντες ταύτας τὰς χώρας τὰς καταλεχθείσας τράπονται ἐπί τε Προκόννησον καὶ Ἀρτάκην, πυρὶ δὲ καὶ ταύτας νείμαντες ἔπλεον

---

general statement, 1. 169 *ad fin.*, is plainly questionable. The acquisition of Phoenicia by Kambyses (cp. 3. 19) and the conquest of Egypt had put ships at the disposal of the Great King. Samos was the first island that surrendered to the Persians, 3. 44, though the story in 3. 120 ff. seems to imply that the Persian annexation was later, cp. 3. 139. The conquest, or more probably the surrender of Chios and of Lesbos, is not expressly recorded, but seems implied as an antecedent of the story of the Scythian expedition, cp. 4. 97, 138. They are not of sufficient importance to be separately nominated in the Behistun inscription, but they may perhaps be included in 'Ionia' or in 'those which are of the sea' (Kypros ?) col. i. § 6.

33. 1. **ἀπαλλασσόμενος.** The date of these operations in the Hellespont falls in any case in 493 B.C., even if it should be thought that Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos would have been reduced immediately after Lade, or at least after the fall of Miletos.

2. **τὰ ἐπὶ δεξιά.** No details have been given since the capture of Kymae (5. 123), for the battle at †Malene (c. 29 *supra*) was subsequent to the advance of the Phoenicians (c. 28 *supra*). The revolt, started at Miletos, had spread to the 'Hellespont' as well as Aeolis, and as afterwards appears (cc. 43-45 *infra*), had given the Thracians and Macedonians an opportunity of recovering their independence.

3. **αὐτοῖσι τ. Π.** Not the Phoenicians. The places on the left are of course European (*αἱ ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ infra*). Whether Hdt. could have 'orientated' them correctly is doubtful ; cp. 7. 36.

4. **τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου.** This passage shows clearly that under the term Hellespont Hdt. includes all the waters between the Aegean and the Pontos. On occasion, however, he uses the term in a stricter sense. Cp. 5. 122, 4. 85.

5. **Πέρινθος**, 5. 1.

6. **τὰ ἐπὶ Θρηίκης**, a common expression in Thucydides, is an *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in Hdt. with a somewhat different sense. The following passage from the *Periplus* of Skylax, c. 67 (quoted by Baehr *ad loc.*) is apposite : *μετὰ δὲ τὴν Χερρόνησόν ἐστι Θρᾴκια τείχη τάδε· πρῶτον Λευκὴ ἀκτή, Τειρίστασις, Ἡράκλεια, Γάνος, Γανίας, Νέον τεῖχος, Πέρινθος πόλις καὶ λιμήν, Δαμινὸν τεῖχος, Σηλυμβρία πόλις καὶ λιμήν* (Müller, *Geogr. Min.* i. 56). The description added to Perinthos and Selymbria explains the special mention of them by Hdt. The Phoenicians on this occasion perhaps believed that they were recovering and securing the water-way from which they had been excluded for generations. Yet their reluctance to pursue the Byzantine and Kalchedonian fugitives into the Pontos is observable. They simply make a clean sweep of the Hellespont, Propontis and Bosporos, working round from the European to the Asiatic side.

Βυζάντιον had joined the revolt, 5. 103, and the expression there would cover the case of Kalchedon, and others.

10. **οἴκησαν**, 'took up their abode in.'

On *Mesambria* cp. 4. 93 *supra*. Van H. reads *οἴκισαν* (*sic*). AB have *ωικησαν*, and ABC *θηλυμβρίην*.

11. **Προκόννησον καὶ Ἀρτάκην**, 4. 14 *supra*.

αὖτις ἐς τὴν Χερσόνησον ἐξαιρήσοντες τὰς ἐπιλοίπους τῶν πολίων, ὅσας πρότερον προσσχόντες οὐ κατέσυραν. ἐπὶ δὲ Κύζικον οὐδὲ ἔπλωσαν ἀρχήν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ Κυζικηνοὶ ἔτι πρότερον τοῦ Φοινίκων ἐσπλόου ἐγεγόνεσαν ὑπὸ βασιλέι, Οἰβάρεϊ τῷ Μεγαβάζου ὁμολογήσαντες τῷ ἐν Δασκυλείῳ ὑπάρχῳ.

34 Τῆς δὲ Χερσονήσου πλὴν Καρδίης πόλιος τὰς ἄλλας πάσας ἐχειρώσαντο οἱ Φοίνικες. ἐτυράννευε δὲ αὐτέων μέχρι τότε Μιλτιάδης ὁ Κίμωνος τοῦ Στησαγόρεω, κτησαμένου τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην πρότερον Μιλτιάδεω τοῦ Κυψέλου τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. εἶχον Δόλογκοι Θρήικες τὴν Χερσόνησον ταύτην. οὗτοι ὦν οἱ Δόλογκοι πιεσθέντες πολέμῳ ὑπὸ Ἀψινθίων ἐς Δελφοὺς ἔπεμψαν τοὺς βασιλέας περὶ τοῦ πολέμου χρησομένους. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφι ἀνεῖλε οἰκιστὴν ἐπάγεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν χώρην τοῦτον ὃς ἄν σφεας

---

15. **Κύζικον**, like Samos, Lesbos, and probably other towns (Sigeion, *e.g.*) had made terms for itself, profiting perhaps by the jealousies of rival satraps. Cp. 3. 120, 126. The Daskylean satrapy presumably corresponds to the τρίτος νομός, 3. 90. Cp. Thuc. 1. 129, and Arnold's note to Thuc. 8. 5.

16. **Οἰβάρεϊ**. Apparently a brother of Bubares 5. 21.

34. 1. **Καρδίης**. Why was Kardia spared? Rawlinson says: "Cardia probably escaped at this time from its position deep in the gulf of Xeros." The meaning of this enigmatical sentence appears to be that Kardia owed its immunity to its geographical position. This explanation seems hardly adequate. Blakesley supposes that Kardia was faithful to Persia and therefore escaped. The mention of Kardia in 7. 58 illustrates its position, and that in 9. 115 the subsequent hold of the Persians upon it.

3. **Μιλτιάδης**. Miltiades, son of Kimon, son of Stesagoras, evacuated the Chersonese on the advance of the Phoenician navy: this is the clear statement of Hdt.; cp. c. 41 *infra*. Miltiades, son of Kypselos, is here mentioned for the first time: his patronymic suggests a tie with the Corinthian dynasty, 5. 92 ε, c. 128 *infra*.

5. **Δόλογκοι**. Little more than a name. Steph. Byz. has it that they had their name from Dolonkos, a brother of Bithynos, *i.e.* they were one of the great group of cognate stems found on both sides of the Hellespont; cp. Giseke, *Thrakisch-Pelasgische Stämme*, p. 11.

6. **Ἀψινθίων**. Also Thracian barbarians, cp. 9. 119, practising human sacrifice. Ainos, the town at the mouth of the Hebros (4. 90) described as a πόλις Αἰολίς (7. 58), also bare the name of Apsinthos, and probably was on their territory, which lay north of the gulf of Melas, even as the Chersonese lay south. The form of the story which reverses the parts of the Dolonki and Apsinthii (see Blakesley note *ad l.*) deserves no credit.

Δελφούς. If the Thracian Dolonki really consulted Delphi after the year 560 B.C. it may have been for the purpose of obtaining, or encouraging, a Greek settlement to make head against the Apsinthii. The Athenians were already nursing ideas of expansion in the north-east. According to Diog. L. 1. 2 the idea was started by Solon. Peisistratos and his sons entertained similar views (cp. 5. 94, 95). One is tempted to refer the matter, which Corn. Nepos narrates of Miltiades son of Kimon (*vita* 1), to Miltiades son of Kypselos, and to suppose that the application to Delphi emanated from the Athenians. Its transfer to the Dolonki would be an even better compliment to Miltiades and his house. According to another tradition it was Miltiades who directed the Dolonki to Delphi to obtain a sanction for the commission to him. Schol. Aristeid. pag. 209 (Fr.).

τοὺς βασιλέας. That the Dolonki were under 'kings' would the better excuse the monarchy of Miltiades.

8. **ἀνεῖλε**. The verses unfortunately are not preserved: but οἰκιστὴν ἐπάγεσθαι may have been one of the endings.

ἀπιόντας ἐκ τοῦ ἱροῦ πρῶτος ἐπὶ ξείνια καλέσῃ. ἰόντες δὲ οἱ
Δόλογκοι τὴν ἱρὴν ὁδὸν διὰ Φωκέων τε καὶ Βοιωτῶν ἤισαν· καί
σφεας ὡς οὐδεὶς ἐκάλεε, ἐκτράπονται ἐπ' Ἀθηνέων. ἐν δὲ τῇσι 35
Ἀθήνῃσι τηνικαῦτα εἶχε μὲν τὸ πᾶν κράτος Πεισίστρατος, ἀτὰρ
ἐδυνάστευέ γε καὶ Μιλτιάδης ὁ Κυψέλου ἐὼν οἰκίης τεθριπποτρόφου, τὰ μὲν ἀνέκαθεν ἀπ' Αἰακοῦ τε καὶ Αἰγίνης γεγονώς, τὰ δὲ νεώτερα Ἀθηναῖος, Φιλαίου τοῦ Αἴαντος παιδὸς γενομένου πρώτου τῆς οἰκίης ταύτης Ἀθηναίου. οὗτος ὁ Μιλτιάδης κατήμενος ἐν τοῖσι προθύροισι τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ, ὁρέων τοὺς Δολόγκους παριόντας ἐσθῆτα ἔχοντας οὐκ ἐγχωρίην καὶ αἰχμὰς προσεβώσατο καί σφι προσελθοῦσι ἐπηγγείλατο καταγωγὴν καὶ ξείνια. οἱ δὲ δεξάμενοι καὶ ξεινισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξέφαινον πᾶν τὸ μαντήιον, ἐκφήναντες δὲ ἐδέοντο αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ μιν πείθεσθαι. Μιλτιάδεα

It was probably not in Delphi that Hdt. heard this story.

10. **τὴν ἱρὴν ὁδὸν** cannot be the road ᾗ νῦν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν Πυθιάδα πέμπουσι Strabo, 422, if the Dolonki went out of their way (ἐκτράπονται) to come by Athens. But van Herwerden regards the ἐκ as "dittographia natum." That the Dolonki, if they went to Delphi at all, went *via* Athens is possible, though Peisistratos was not on the best terms with the oracle. The Sacred Way may be the road to Eleusis, on which, in the Deme Lakiadai, was the family house of the Philaidai (Plutarch, *Kimon*, 10, *C. I. A.* i. 179), although the Deme of their own name was near Brauron, and with it they presumably had at some time a local connexion. Thracians might very well be on the road to or from Brauron (as their port): the reference to the Sacred Way may be due to the position of the family house in Hdt.'s time. There was nothing unusual in an Athenian's having land and houses in more than one Deme (cp. Haussoullier, *Vie municipale en Attique*, p. 67).

35. 2. **τηνικαῦτα.** The adventure of Miltiades will fall during the first usurpation of Peisistratos *c.* 559 B.C. Cp. Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* ii.[3] p. 232, Toeppfer, *Attisch. Geneal.* p. 280.

3. **ἐδυνάστευε.** Lykurgos, son of Aristolaïdes, is represented, 1. 59, as leader of the Pediaei. Probably Miltiades, son of Kypselos, was only second to him. At a later time Isagoras, son of Tisandros, that is probably a man of the Philaid lineage, was leader of the faction. See 5. 66, and c. 128 *infra*.

Μιλτιάδης. This Miltiades was not the first of the name (and lineage) if Pausanias was right in making a Miltiades Archon in 664 B.C., and again in 659 B.C., Pausan. 4. 23, 5, and 8. 39, 2. Cp. Clinton, *F. H. ad ann.*

Κυψέλου. This Kypselos was probably a namesake and relative of the great Corinthian. Cp. c. 128 *infra*, and the analogous instance of the Athenian Kleisthenes, 5. 69.

τεθριπποτρόφου, "id quod dicere non potuisset nisi agros latos in campo plano gens possidebat," Petersen, *Quaestiones de Historia Gentium Atticarum*, p. 22. On the introduction of the τέθριππος cp. 4. 189.

4. **τὰ ἀνέκαθεν**, 5. 65.

Αἰακοῦ, 5. 89.

5. **Αἴαντος.** Another tradition (Pausan. 1. 35, 2) placed Philaios a step further from Aias, making him son of Eurysakes, the only son of Aias recognised by Sophokles (Petersen, *Quaestiones* etc., p. 18).

8. **αἰχμάς.** The carrying arms, and spears not least of all, would have been out of fashion by that time (Thuc. 1. 6), not to say contrary to the Peisistratid police regulations! (Thuc. 6. 56, 2). (The ἐξοπλισία recorded Ἀθ. π. 15 is, however, dated to the (supposed) 'third' usurpation. This of course is quite different from the act of Hippias, recorded by Thuc. 6. 58. Cp. Appendix IX.)

11. **αὐτοῦ . . μιν.** ἐδέοντο requires a genitive (c. 13 *supra*, 5. 81), and μιν is accusative before the infinitive *in or. obliq.* Just below τὰ should be τῶν but for attraction.

δὲ ἀκούσαντα παραυτίκα ἔπεισε ὁ λόγος οἷα ἀχθόμενόν τε τῇ
Πεισιστράτου ἀρχῇ καὶ βουλόμενον ἐκποδὼν· εἶναι. αὐτίκα δὲ
ἐστάλη ἐς Δελφούς, ἐπειρησόμενος τὸ χρηστήριον εἰ ποιοίη τά
36 περ αὐτοῦ οἱ Δόλογκοι προσεδέοντο. κελευούσης δὲ καὶ τῆς
Πυθίης, οὕτω δὴ Μιλτιάδης ὁ Κυψέλου, Ὀλύμπια ἀναραιρηκὼς
πρότερον τούτων τεθρίππῳ, τότε παραλαβὼν Ἀθηναίων πάντα
τὸν βουλόμενον μετέχειν τοῦ στόλου ἔπλεε ἅμα τοῖσι Δολόγκοισι,
καὶ ἔσχε τὴν χώρην· καί μιν οἱ ἐπαγαγόμενοι τύραννον κατεστή-
σαντο. ὁ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ἀπετείχισε τὸν ἰσθμὸν τῆς Χερσονήσου
ἐκ Καρδίης πόλιος ἐς Πακτύην, ἵνα μὴ ἔχοιέν σφεας οἱ Ἀψίνθιοι
δηλέεσθαι ἐσβάλλοντες ἐς τὴν χώρην. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι στάδιοι
ἕξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ τούτου ἡ
Χερσόνησος ἔσω πᾶσά ἐστι σταδίων εἴκοσι καὶ τετρακοσίων τὸ
37 μῆκος. ἀποτειχίσας ὦν τὸν αὐχένα τῆς Χερσονήσου ὁ Μιλτιά-
δης καὶ τοὺς Ἀψινθίους τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ὠσάμενος, τῶν λοιπῶν
πρώτοισι ἐπολέμησε Λαμψακηνοῖσι· καί μιν οἱ Λαμψακηνοὶ
λοχήσαντες αἱρέουσι ζωγρίῃ. ἦν δὲ ὁ Μιλτιάδης Κροίσῳ τῷ

---

36. 2. **Ὀλύμπια ἀναραιρηκώς.** Cp. c. 103 *infra*. Such an event would probably have been inscribed. Cp. Introduction, p. lx.

3. **πρότερον τούτων**, 560 B.C., the date of the first usurpation of Peisistratos was Ol. 55. If this was the date of the victory, the disgust of Miltiades with the success of his rival at home would have been all the keener.

5. **τύραννον κατεστήσαντο** (*sic*). He is thus not to blame. He went as oikist; they made him tyrant during his life, and worshipped him after his death, c. 38 *infra*. κατέστησαν (β) seems right.

6. **ἀπετείχισε.** This wall was subsequently restored by Perikles, Plutarch, *Perikles*, 19, and by Derkylidas, Xen. *Hell.* 3. 2, 10.

7. **Καρδίης.** Kardia being north, on the gulf of Melas, Paktya south, on the Propontis, E. of the closing to the Hellespont. Thither Alkibiades retired on his deposition after Notion. Xen. *Hell.* 1. 5, 17, cpd. with Corn. Nepos *Alc.* c. 7. One of Alcibiades' erections was Neonteichos.

8. **στάδιοι.** No one finds fault with these measurements. Had the land been measured for the Periklean Kleruchy in 447 B.C.? (On the date see Busolt, *Gr. G.* ii. p. 536.)

37. 2. **τοιούτῳ.** The Apsinthii had no boats apparently, or no hope of circumventing the wall. The oracle given to the Knidians would seem to condemn the work of Miltiades (1. 174 πυργοῦτε).

τῶν λοιπῶν might be taken to imply that Miltiades had a number of enemies, if not a coalition, to contend with; the Attic occupation of the Chersonese may well have excited the hostility of tribes and towns, on both sides the Hellespont.

3. **Λαμψακηνοῖσι.** On Lampsakos see 5. 117. At this time Lampsakos was perhaps already under the tyranny (cp. 4. 138). But if so, the tyrants were not so loyal to Lydia as afterwards to Persia. The enmity of Lampsakos to the Philaid dynasty in the Chersonese might not be unacceptable to Peisistratos and his successors. Cp. Thuc. 6. 59, 3.

4. **Κροίσῳ.** How is the friendship of Kroisos for Miltiades son of Kypselos, for the contemporary head of the Alkmaionid family (cp. c. 125 *infra*) to say nothing of Solon (1. 29), to be reconciled with the Lydian king's apparent ignorance of the condition of Athens, and that indeed shortly before his overthrow (1. 56, 59)? Miltiades, Kroisos, and the Alkmaionidae were all well thought of at Delphi. Not so, perhaps, Peisistratos: the inconsequence in Hdt. may be explained by a difference in the sources, but it remains an inconsequence.

Λυδῷ ἐν γνώμῃ γεγονώς· πυθόμενος ὦν ὁ Κροῖσος ταῦτα, πέμπων
προηγόρευε τοῖσι Λαμψακηνοῖσι μετιέναι Μιλτιάδεα· εἰ δὲ μή
σφεας πίτυος τρόπον ἀπείλεε ἐκτρίψειν. πλανωμένων δὲ τῶν
Λαμψακηνῶν ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι τὸ θέλει τὸ ἔπος εἶναι τό σφι
ἀπείλησε ὁ Κροῖσος, πίτυος τρόπον ἐκτρίψειν, μόγις κοτὲ μαθὼν
τῶν τις πρεσβυτέρων εἶπε τὸ ἐόν, ὅτι πίτυς μούνη πάντων
δενδρέων ἐκκοπεῖσα βλαστὸν οὐδένα μετιεῖ ἀλλὰ πανώλεθρος
ἐξαπόλλυται. δείσαντες ὦν οἱ Λαμψακηνοὶ Κροῖσον λύσαντες
μετῆκαν Μιλτιάδεα. οὗτος μὲν δὴ διὰ Κροῖσον ἐκφεύγει, μετὰ 38
δὲ τελευτᾷ ἄπαις, τὴν ἀρχήν τε καὶ τὰ χρήματα παραδοὺς
Στησαγόρῃ τῷ Κίμωνος ἀδελφεοῦ παιδὶ ὁμομητρίου. καί οἱ
τελευτήσαντι Χερσονησῖται θύουσι ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῇ, καὶ ἀγῶνα

---

7. **πίτυος τρόπον.** The old name of Lampsakos was Pityoëssa, changed by the Phokaian colonists to Lampsakos in honour of Lampsake, daughter of the king Mandron, who had saved them from her father's treachery. After her death she was worshipped as a deity (ὡς θεῷ θύειν), see Plutarch, *de virt. mul.* p. 255, who found the story in Charon of Lampsakos (Müller, *Frag. Hist. Gr.* i. p. 33). No adult Lampsakene could have been at a loss for an explanation of the bitter jest of Kroisos: nor could Hdt. had he read—or remembered—the passage in Charon. With the phraseology of this passage cp. 5. 80.

38. 2. **ἄπαις,** 'without leaving male issue,' cp. 5. 48. If Miltiades son of Kypselos had a daughter, she would have been ἐπίκληρος, and might have been married to Stesagoras son of Kimon, the half-brother of Miltiades. There is, however, no mention of an ἐπίκληρος in the case. This Stesagoras also dies ἄπαις, and is succeeded by his full brother Miltiades, named presumably after the Philaid, son of Kypselos. The question, however, arises whether Stesagoras (c. 34 *supra*) the stepfather of Miltiades, son of Kypselos, was not himself a Philaid? (cp. Petersen, *Hist. gent. Attic.* p. 25, Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie*, p. 280). In that case the tie between Stesagoras *Kimonis* and Miltiades *Kypseli* would have been agnatic and not merely matriarchal. The Kimonidae, so to speak, are afterwards recognised as Philaidae, which could hardly have been done simply under the arrangement described in the text, without strict descent or adoption. Adoption there may have been in any case. But it is difficult to suppose that the Philaid Miltiades had no agnates: it was perhaps, however, remembered as remarkable that his nearest agnate was also his brother uterine though not paternal. In short, Stesagoras, father of Kimon, and Kypselos, father of Miltiades, may have been full brothers, and the second marriage of N or M the mother of Miltiades *Kypseli* and of Kimon *Stesagorae* may have been a case of the Levirate, Kypselos and Stesagoras being themselves full brothers, though this fact is glossed over in the tradition of a later time under the influence of later law. In any case the stress laid upon the uterine tie is noticeable. Ideas and customs connected with the matriarchate died very hard at Athens; cp. c. 131 *infra*, and M'Lennan's *Kinship in Ancient Greece*, which makes no use of this case (*Studies in Anc. Hist.* 1886, pp. 195 ff.).

τὴν ἀρχήν τε καὶ τὰ χρήματα may be taken as both limited to the Chersonese.

4. **Χερσονησῖται θύουσι.** The present tense might merely be in continuation of ἐκφεύγει· τελευτᾷ, yet it is probable that worship was still paid to the great oikist of the Chersonese at the date of Hdt.'s writing. It was presumably the Attic element which mainly supported the cult, revived, if not established, in the days of the Kimonian victories. Cp. Introduction, p. lxiv.

ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῇ. An instance of that Hero-worship which was the quintessence of Hellenic religion. Cp. 5. 47, 114, and for the oikist, Thuc. 5. 11.

ἱππικόν τε καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπιστᾶσι, ἐν τῷ Λαμψακηνῶν οὐδενὶ ἐγγίνεται ἀγωνίζεσθαι. πολέμου δὲ ἐόντος πρὸς Λαμψακηνοὺς καὶ Στησαγόρεα κατέλαβε ἀποθανεῖν ἄπαιδα, πληγέντα τὴν κεφαλὴν πελέκεϊ ἐν τῷ πρυτανηίῳ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς αὐτομόλου μὲν τῷ λόγῳ πολεμίου δὲ καὶ ὑποθερμοτέρου τῷ ἔργῳ.

39 *τελευτήσαντος δὲ καὶ Στησαγόρεω τρόπῳ τοιῷδε, ἐνθαῦτα Μιλτιάδεα τὸν Κίμωνος, Στησαγόρεω δὲ τοῦ τελευτήσαντος ἀδελφεόν, καταλαμψόμενον τὰ πρήγματα ἐπὶ Χερσονήσου ἀποστέλλουσι τριήρεϊ οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι, οἵ μιν καὶ ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ἐποίευν εὖ ὡς οὐ συνειδότες δῆθεν τοῦ πατρὸς [Κίμωνος] αὐτοῦ τὸν θάνατον, τὸν ἐγὼ ἐν ἄλλῳ λόγῳ σημανέω ὡς ἐγένετο. Μιλτιάδης δὲ ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὴν Χερσόνησον εἶχε κατ' οἴκους, τὸν ἀδελφεὸν Στησαγόρεα δηλαδὴ ἐπιτιμέων. οἱ δὲ Χερσονησῖται πυνθανόμενοι ταῦτα συνελέχθησαν ἀπὸ πασέων τῶν πολίων οἱ δυναστεύοντες πάντοθεν, κοινῷ δὲ στόλῳ ἀπικόμενοι ὡς συλλυπηθησόμενοι ἐδέθησαν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Μιλτιάδης τε δὴ ἴσχει τὴν Χερσόνησον, πεντακοσίους βόσκων ἐπικούρους, καὶ γαμέει Ὀλόρου τοῦ Θρηίκων βασιλέος τὴν θυγατέρα Ἡγησιπύλην.*

---

5. **ἱππικόν.** Specially suitable in this case, cc. 35, 36 *supra*.

οὐδενί. These excommunications robbed the local festivals of all pan-Hellenic significance: cp. 1. 142, 144 (also 5. 88, 72, and c. 81 *infra*); and contrast the rules of the Olympian Agon as stated 2. 160, 5. 22.

6. **πολέμου.** Kroisos is no longer on the throne to stand by the Philaids. The death of Stesagoras is dated by Clinton, *F. H.* c. 515 B.C.

9. **τῷ λόγῳ . . τῷ ἔργῳ.** Not a usual formula with Hdt. Cp. 7. 155. (Thuc. would perhaps have written λόγῳ *μὲν αὐτομόλου ἔργῳ δὲ πολεμίου κτλ.*)

39. 4. **τὰ πρήγματα,** *sc. τὴν ἀρχήν τε καὶ τὰ χρήματα*, c. 38 l. 2 *supra*.

5. **οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι** may be taken to indicate that Hipparchos was still alive. His death falls in 414 B.C. Cp. 5. 55. The rapprochement between the Peisistratids and the Philaids, if correctly reported, looks like a new departure, and perhaps helps to explain the alienation between the Philaids and the Alkmaionidae. Kimon the father (nicknamed Koalemos) had initiated this change during his exile. He was still alive in 524 B.C. if Clinton (with whom Duncker agrees) is right in dating his three Olympian victories, 532, 528, 524 B.C. Cp. c. 103 *infra*. It was not long after the arrival of Miltiades in the Chersonese that Hippias established a connexion with Hippoklos of Lampsakos, cp. 4. 138. The subsequent Philaid tradition was not unfavourable to the memory of the Peisistratids, as is obvious from the excursus in Thuc. 6. 54-59; cp. note to *γαμέει infra*.

6. **Κίμωνος** *secl.* Stein.

τὸν . . ἐγένετο might be a later insertion, even if from the author's hand.

7. **ἐν ἄλλῳ λόγῳ.** This promise is fulfilled in c. 103 *infra*, an indication by the way that the division into Books was not made by the author, much less that by λόγοι we can ever understand the existing divisions, cp. c. 19 *supra*, Introduction, § 2.

10. **πασέων τ. π.** Beside Kardia c. 34, Paktya c. 36 *supra*, Hdt. mentions elsewhere Sestos 4. 143, Madytos 7. 33 and Elaius c. 140 *infra*, as cities in the Chersonese: but this list is far from complete. Xen. *Hell.* 3. 2, 10 gives the number as eleven or twelve (in 398 B.C.). For a complete list, see Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* iii. 1079-1081.

12. **ἴσχει,** as in 3. 39 *ἔσχε πᾶσαν τὴν Σάμον*: 'holds.'

13. **ἐπικούρους.** The 500 mercenaries were presumably Thracians. Nothing is said of his ships here: five are mentioned c. 41 *infra*, and he may have

Οὗτος δὲ ὁ Κίμωνος Μιλτιάδης νεωστὶ μὲν ἐληλύθεε ἐς τὴν Χερσόνησον, κατελάμβανε δέ μιν ἐλθόντα ἄλλα τῶν καταλαβόντων πρηγμάτων χαλεπώτερα. τρίτῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔτεϊ †πρὸ† τούτων Σκύθας ἐκφεύγει. Σκύθαι γὰρ οἱ νομάδες ἐρεθισθέντες ὑπὸ 40

---

served in the fleet of Dareios with that number, 4. 137.

γαμέει. This was at least a second marriage, as his eldest son Metiochos was ἐξ ἄλλης c. 41 *infra*.

Oloros might have been a chief among the Dolonki: there were many tribes of Thracians, and even the Dolonki had several 'kings,' c. 34 *supra*. This Hegesipyla, who has a Greek or Graecised name, was the mother of Kimon the victor at the Eurymedon (cp. Plutarch, *vit. Kim.* 4), and perhaps, by a second marriage, the mother of Oloros the Athenian, father of Thucydides the historian; Kimon who was Strategos in 477 B.C. may have been born about 508-7 B.C. The marriage of Miltiades and Hegesipyla might have taken place about the time of the expulsion of Hippias from Athens. Miltiades died about 488-7 B.C. Hegesipyla, then perhaps 35-40 years old, may have contracted a fresh marriage in the same family. Thucydides the historian might have been the grandson of this lady, and her second husband, and quite old enough in 431 B.C. to form the design of recording the war which began in the spring of that year. He could not then however have been (*pace* Pamphila *apud* Aul. Gell. 15. 23) forty years old (though he must have been at least thirty in 424 B.C.), nor could he be identified with Thucydides the colleague of Pericles in the Samian war (Thuc. 1. 117). That the historian was connected with the house of Kimon and with Thrace may be regarded as certain. Plutarch, *l. c.*, Marcellinus, Suidas, *et al.*

40. 1. **οὗτος κτλ.** This chapter is a mass of *cruces*. The material difficulties are aggravated by ambiguities of expression, and as in other like cases (cp. c. 57 *infra*) it seems not unreasonable to suppose that Hdt. is reproducing traditions which did not present a lucid argument or perspective to his own mind. We are in fact in the presence of an obscure self-contradiction or a clumsy tautology.

The central sentence of the chapter is clear enough. It states as a matter of fact that the nomad Scyths, having received provocation from Dareios, advanced as far as the Chersonese, and that Miltiades fled before them. The Scyths afterwards retired, and Miltiades was restored by the Dolonki. Whether these statements are accurate is a further question: they are not obscure.

Besides this clear statement of possible matters of fact, we have three sentences, two before and one after, of the utmost obscurity, in which vague and abstract terms are used (ἄλλα χαλεπώτερα—τῶν καταλαβόντων πρηγμάτων—τούτων—ταῦτα—τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων). Difficult questions arise as to the significance of these terms, and as to their relations one to another.

Any one reading the first sentence of the chapter would suppose that the words νεωστὶ μὲν ἐληλύθεε referred to the first advent of Miltiades in the Chersonese. So in fact Rawlinson in his translation understands the words. The question remains, to what events, or matters of fact, do the two phrases τῶν καταλαβόντων (*v. l.* κατεχόντων PR, adopted by van Herwerden and Holder) πρηγμάτων and ἄλλα χαλεπώτερα refer? Rawlinson takes τῶν κατεχόντων πρηγμάτων to refer to the advance of the Phoenician fleet (in 493 B.C.) and ἄλλα χαλεπώτερα to the advance of the Scyths; Hdt. wishing to say that, bad as might be what Miltiades experienced from the Phoenicians, it was not so bad as what he had experienced from the Scyths, "three (*sic*) years earlier." According to this interpretation τῶν κατεχόντων πρηγμάτων and τούτων and τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων refer to one and the same event or series of events (flight from the Phoenicians), while ἄλλα χαλεπώτερα and ταῦτα refer to another series of events, that namely specified in the sentence Σκύθαι γὰρ . . ὀπίσω. The principal objections to this interpretation are three: (1) νεωστὶ is nonsense, or, as Rawlinson says, shows "a curious laxity of expression, or a curious forgetfulness of dates." (2) The argument is inverted and well-nigh absurd. 'Miltiades had not been long in the Chersonese when something occurred worse than what (afterwards) happened to him, for, less than three years before being driven clean out by the Phoenicians, he had been obliged by the Scyths to retire for a time, but was

βασιλέος Δαρείου συνεστράφησαν καὶ ἤλασαν μέχρι τῆς Χερσονήσου ταύτης· τούτους ἐπιόντας οὐκ ὑπομείνας ὁ Μιλτιάδης ἔφευγε Χερσόνησον, ἐς ὃ οἵ τε Σκύθαι ἀπαλλάχθησαν καὶ ἐκεῖνον Δόλογκοι κατήγαγον ὀπίσω. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ πρότερον
41 *ἐγεγόνεε τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων. τότε δὲ πυνθανόμενος εἶναι*

---

afterwards restored.' (3) Grammatically, can *τῶν κατεχόντων πρηγμάτων* refer to a period subsequent to the date of *κατελάμβανε δέ μιν ἐλθόντα ἄλλα χ.*? If the text here were *τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων*, referring to *μέχρι τότε* c. 34 *supra*, such a sense might be got into it, though even then we might expect *κατελελαβήκεε* for *κατελάμβανε*, *i.e.* *κατελελαβήκεε δέ μιν ἐλθόντα ἄλλα τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων πρηγμάτων χαλεπώτερα*.

As the text stands the first sentence of the chapter says that orever Miltiades had been long in the Chersonese he was overtaken by greater hardships than he experienced before (deaths of his father, and brother, and the difficulties of succession). The text then went on to say, until Stein inserted *πρό*, that less than three years *after* his arrival he was expelled by the Scyths, and remained in exile (*ἔφευγε*), how long it is not stated, until he was brought back by the Dolonki, only to be again driven out, less than three years afterwards, by the Phoenicians. The objections to this interpretation are two: (1) the difficulty and indeed impossibility of making any rational chronology; (2) the obvious intention of the author to supply in the last sentence *ταῦτα μὲν δὴ κτλ.* an elucidation of the text preceding, and the consequent necessity to take the repeated *τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ* as an identical date with the former *τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ*. If we might omit the whole sentence *τρίτῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔτεϊ τούτων Σκύθας ἐκφεύγει*, the difficulties would be solved, save that (1) *νεωστί* would remain a stumbling-block, and (2) the Scythian invasion would still be problematic. The sense would then run: 'Before Miltiades had been long in the Chersonese he had a worse experience than any (in Athens, Thrace, or Scythia) that befell him so far. For the Scyths invaded the Hellespont, and he had to retire and remained (many years, 510-495 ??) in exile, until the Dolonki restored him, two years before the advance of the Phoenicians.'

Feeling the grave objections to these interpretations we may follow Stein in understanding *ἐληλύθεε* and *ἐλθόντα*, in the light of *κατήγαγον ὀπίσω* below, as equivalent to *κατεληλύθεε* and *κατελθόντα*, and in inserting *πρό*, or at least interpreting *τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ τούτων* as *τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ πρότερον*. We thus obtain a perfectly consistent and intelligible sense. *νεωστὶ μὲν* refers to his flight and restoration (*τῶν καταλαβόντων πρηγμάτων* and *ταῦτα*) about 496-5 B.C. some two years or so before the advance of the Phoenicians (*ἄλλα χαλεπώτερα* and *τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων*). The sense or argument then runs: Miltiades who was tyrant of the Chersonese (c. 34 *supra*) at this time had not been long there, having been *restored* to his tyranny after an exile (due to the Scythic incursion) only some two years before; and he had now to evacuate the territory before the advancing Phoenicians, this time never to return. In spite of Cobet's *fatuum est conjungere κατελάμβανε—τῶν καταλαβόντων* (*Mnemosyne*, N.S. xii. p. 155), we therefore adhere to the reading of ABC (a) on sensible grounds.

A further and material question remains, whether the Scyths really made their appearance on the Hellespont about the year 496 B.C. a year or two before the suppression of the Ionian revolt? If so, Miltiades, Sparta (cp. c. 84 *infra*) the Greek rebels, all lost a grand opportunity. But this visit of the Scythians in their wrath is singularly tardy and ineffective; and Miltiades was the last man the Scyths should have penalised, if only they had known his account of the affair at the bridge, 4. 137. Hence Blakesley's suggestion deserves favour that the Scythians have been substituted for Thracians by the tradition, though we need not follow him in supposing that the Thracians who drave Miltiades out about 496 B.C. were the same who had just put an end to Aristagoras (497 B.C., cp. 5. 126). In any case the fortunes and acts of Miltiades between the Scythic expedition in 512 B.C. and his return to Athens in 493 B.C. are almost a blank. Cp. c. 137 *infra*.

41. 1. **τότε**, 493 B.C. Cc. 33, 34 *supra* seem to imply that Byzantion, Chal-

τοὺς Φοίνικας ἐν Τενέδῳ, πληρώσας τριήρεας πέντε χρημάτων τῶν παρεόντων ἀπέπλεε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας. καὶ ὥσπερ ὁρμήθη ἐκ Καρδίης πόλιος ἔπλεε διὰ τοῦ Μέλανος κόλπου· παραμείβετό τε τὴν Χερσόνησον καὶ οἱ Φοίνικές οἱ περιπίπτουσι τῇσι νηυσί. αὐτὸς μὲν δὴ Μιλτιάδης σὺν τῇσι τέσσερσι τῶν νεῶν καταφεύγει ἐς Ἴμβρον, τὴν δέ οἱ πέμπτην τῶν νεῶν κατεῖλον διώκοντες οἱ Φοίνικες. τῆς δὲ νεὸς ταύτης ἔτυχε τῶν Μιλτιάδεω παίδων ὁ πρεσβύτατος ἄρχων Μητίοχος, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς Ὀλόρου τοῦ Θρήικος ἐὼν θυγατρὸς ἀλλ' ἐξ ἄλλης· καὶ τοῦτον ἅμα τῇ νηὶ εἷλον οἱ Φοίνικες, καί μιν πυθόμενοι ὡς εἴη Μιλτιάδεω παῖς ἀνήγαγον παρὰ βασιλέα, δοκέοντες χάριτα μεγάλην καταθήσεσθαι, ὅτι δὴ Μιλτιάδης γνώμην ἀπεδέξατο ἐν τοῖσι Ἴωσι πείθεσθαι κελεύων τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι, ὅτε οἱ Σκύθαι προσεδέοντο λύσαντας τὴν σχεδίην ἀποπλέειν ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν. Δαρεῖος δέ, ὡς οἱ Φοίνικες Μητίοχον τὸν Μιλτιάδεω ἀνήγαγον, ἐποίησε κακὸν μὲν οὐδὲν Μητίοχον, ἀγαθὰ δὲ συχνά· καὶ γὰρ οἶκον καὶ κτῆσιν ἔδωκε καὶ Περσίδα γυναῖκα, ἐκ τῆς οἱ τέκνα ἐγένετο τὰ ἐς Πέρσας κεκοσμέαται. Μιλτιάδης δὲ ἐξ Ἴμβρου ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας.

Καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν Περσέων οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλέον 42 ἐγένετο τούτων ἐς νεῖκος φέρον Ἴωσι, ἀλλὰ τάδε μὲν χρήσιμα

---

kedon, Prokonnesos, Artake were visited by the Phoenicians before they completed the devastation of the Chersonese. Miltiades' flight might here be supposed to have been postponed till after the return of the Phoenicians to the Hellespont from the Bosporos. The mention of Tenedos, however, carries us back to c. 31, and makes it appear that the flight of Miltiades was upon the first approach of the Phoenicians from the south. His starting from Kardia (rather than Sestos, or one of the Hellespontine towns) supports that conclusion. Cp. the movement of Histiaios from Thasos, c. 28 *supra*.

4. With the *parataxis* cp. 5. 108 *supra*.

7. **Ἴμβρον**, the nearest island.

12. **ὅτι δὴ κτλ.** Cp. 4. 137. The reason alleged may of course be a mere inference. The treatment of Metiochos by Dareios does not make the story of Miltiades' supposed advice at the Danube any more probable. The captured fugitive is treated rather as a benefactor, or benefactor's son, cp. c. 30 *supra*. Thereafter presumably Metiochos 'medized.' He may have been at Marathon in 490 B.C. or at Athens in 480 B.C.—who knows? Anyway, his total disappearance from the Hellenic tradition is remarkable. The name is found afterwards in Athens in a modified form (Metichos), borne by one of the Periklean (?) architects, after whom one of the Dikasteria was named (cp. Pollux, *Onomast.* 8. 121): according to the comedians, a pluralist. Cp. Plutarch, *Mor.* 811, where Μητίοχος is read, but Μήτιχος would suit better.

18. **ἐγένετο . . κεκοσμέαται.** The conjunction of the singular and plural is remarkable.

19. **ἀπικνέεται.** Presumably before the end of the year 493 B.C.

42. 1. **τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο.** Apparently, like the year of Thucydides, this is a campaigning year from spring to spring: cp. cc. 31, 43; *τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο* here being the *δεύτερον ἔτος* of c. 31, or 'year after' the capture of Miletos, or, according to our reckoning, from spring of 493 B.C. to spring of 492 B.C. Cp. Appendix VI.

2. **τούτων** vaguely for the events narrated cc. 31, 32, 33, 41.

ἐς νεῖκος φέρον. Cp. *τὰ ἐς ἄκεσιν φέροντα* 4. 90.

τάδε. On the omission of the name of Hekataios in this connexion, see

κάρτα τοῖσι Ἴωσι ἐγένετο τούτου τοῦ ἔτεος· Ἀρταφρένης ὁ Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος μεταπεμψάμενος ἀγγέλους ἐκ τῶν πολίων συνθήκας σφίσι αὐτοῖσι τοὺς Ἴωνας ἠνάγκασε ποιέεσθαι, ἵνα δοσίδικοι εἶεν καὶ μὴ ἀλλήλους φέροιέν τε καὶ ἄγοιεν. ταῦτά

Appendix VI., Introduction, p. lxvii. Two useful and pacific measures affecting the Ionians are ascribed to Artaphrenes satrap of Sardes and dated to the year 493 B.C. (1) the institution of (commercial) treaties establishing δικαί (ἀπὸ συμβόλων) throughout Ionia, and suppressing all private or local warfare and piracy. (For samples of such treaties elsewhere, later, see Hicks, *Manual of Inscript.* No. 31.) (2) A new census and assessment of tribute, which Hdt. appears to say was still in existence and of force in his own day, and indeed at the time of writing (διατελέουσι).

In regard to the first of these measures it is probable that such arrangements were already in force between at least some of the Ionian cities, and perhaps between the states represented at Naukratis (cp. 2. 178, c. 21 *supra*). But the arrangement may have been revived and extended by Artaphrenes at this time. In any case the precedent would be welcome at Athens. In regard to the second measure, it is likely enough that a new assessment was made, after the reduction of Ionia, and the other revolted *tributaries*, Hdt. himself stating that they had been tributary previously for about the same amount (cp. 3. 90). The further statement that this census was still in force gives rise to questions which can only be hypothetically solved. Blakesley took the statement as "decisively proving" the subjection of the Asiatic Hellenes to the king of Persia, at a time when the restoration of their liberty by Athenian arms was a favourite topic with Athenian orators. But did the unhappy Ionians then pay tribute twice over, to Persia and to Athens, at the same time? Grote maintains that no Greek city on the coast paid tribute to Persia between 476 and 412 B.C., cp. Thuc. 8. 5, 5, and explains this passage as meaning that the tribute was assessed, but not paid! Rawlinson's polemic against Grote is here conclusive: Hdt. could not have been ignorant whether tribute was paid or not, and would not have expressed himself as he has done, had he meant that the claim was made but not recognised after 476 B.C. Moreover Thuc. 1. 138, though not referring strictly to Ionian cities, may be quoted against Grote. When Rawlinson goes on to date the emancipation of the Greek cities on the mainland as late as 449 B.C. and to connect it with a (fabulous) "treaty of Cyprus" his view requires correction. The argument from the Athenian Tribute lists points to the conclusion that the Greek cities in Ionia and Karia remained subject and tributary to Persia till the battle of the Eurymedon in 465 B.C. The effect of that battle was the enlargement of the Ionian tribute, by the inclusion of many cities on the main, and the addition of the Karian region. Some ten years later, however, the crushing disaster on the island of Prosopitis led (as Duncker has made probable) to the transfer of the treasure from Delos to Athens for safety, and to the loss of a large number of the tributary cities on the Asiatic main, which passed back probably to the Persians. Under Perikles the Confederacy suffered diminution in area, but many cities on the mainland continued to pay tribute to Athens down to the Peace of Nikias, and later (*C. I. A.* i. pp. 226 ff.). Whether this passage in Hdt. refers to the condition of the Ionian states before 465 B.C. or after 454 B.C., or both, is not quite clear, but it is on the whole more probable that it was written after the later date, and there would then never have been any need to revise it. In no case is the passage satisfactory, for it is not sufficiently explicit. Hdt. refers only to 'the Ionians'; of Dorians, Aeolians, Karians he says nothing. The conduct and fortunes of the Dorians here as throughout the period are unnoticed. Even in regard to 'the Ionians,' he does not make it plain whether the islanders or any of them are included. He is only concerned to put on record the fact that payments were still being made on the assessment of Artaphrenes. (For the facts in regard to the Athenian tribute, Köhler, *Abhand. der Berlin. Akademie*, 1869;

τε ἠνάγκασε ποιέειν, καὶ τὰς χώρας μετρήσας σφέων κατὰ παρασάγγας, τοὺς καλέουσι οἱ Πέρσαι τὰ τριήκοντα στάδια, κατὰ δὴ τούτους μετρήσας φόρους ἔταξε ἑκάστοισι, οἳ κατὰ χώρην διατελέουσι ἔχοντες ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου αἰεὶ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ὡς ἐτάχθησαν ἐξ Ἀρταφρένεος· ἐτάχθησαν δὲ σχεδὸν κατὰ ταὐτὰ καὶ πρότερον εἶχον. καί σφι ταῦτα μὲν εἰρηναῖα ἦν.

43 Ἅμα δὲ τῷ ἔαρι, τῶν ἄλλων καταλελυμένων στρατηγῶν ἐκ βασιλέος, Μαρδόνιος ὁ Γοβρύεω κατέβαινε ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, στρατὸν πολλὸν μὲν κάρτα πεζὸν ἅμα ἀγόμενος πολλὸν δὲ ναυτικόν, ἡλικίην τε νέος ἐὼν καὶ νεωστὶ γεγαμηκὼς βασιλέος Δαρείου θυγατέρα Ἀρτοζώστρην· ἄγων δὲ τὸν στρατὸν τοῦτον ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ Κιλικίῃ, αὐτὸς μὲν ἐπιβὰς ἐπὶ νεὸς ἐκομίζετο ἅμα τῇσι ἄλλῃσι νηυσί, στρατιὴν δὲ τὴν πεζὴν ἄλλοι ἡγεμόνες ἦγον ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον. ὡς δὲ παραπλέων τὴν Ἀσίην ἀπίκετο ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην, ἐνθαῦτα μέγιστον θῶμα ἐρέω τοῖσι μὴ ἀποδεκομένοισι Ἑλλήνων Περσέων τοῖσι ἑπτὰ Ὀτάνεα γνώμην ἀποδέξασθαι ὡς χρεὸν εἴη δημοκρατέεσθαι Πέρσας· τοὺς γὰρ τυράννους τῶν Ἰώνων καταπαύσας πάντας ὁ Μαρδόνιος δημοκρατίας κατίστα ἐς τὰς πόλιας. ταῦτα δὲ

Kirchhoff, *Hermes*, xi.; Busolt, *Gr. G.* ii. 405, 417, 499 ff.; Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alt.* viii. 214, 355).

7. **σφέων . . μετρήσας** (PR) seems preferable. The words τοὺς . . στάδια, though fully anticipated by 5. 53 *supra*, are not therefore to be deleted.

43. 1. **τῷ ἔαρι.** The spring of 492 B.C., the midsummer of which = Ol. 72.

τῶν ἄλλων, *e.g.* Harpagos, c. 30 *supra*. Otanes 5. 123. Cp. c. 9 *supra* and the anonymous strategi of cc. 6, 9 etc.

ἐκ βασιλέος. Not by the satrap, Dareios directing the war, or at least appointing the commanders himself. But the Persian commanders in Asia Minor can hardly have been actually cashiered; possibly Mardonios was appointed commander-in-chief. The conjecture that he superseded Artaphrenes as satrap in Sardis (P. Krumbholz, *De Asiae min. satrap.* p. 26) is not satisfactory. He is here named for the first time. His father, Gobryas, was one of the celebrated Seven, 3. 70, and Dareios apparently named one of his own sons after him, 7. 72.

4. **ἡλικίην νέος.** Thucydides calls Alkibiades *νέος* at the age of thirty, 5. 43, 2. Mardonios had only thirteen years and a few months to live (cp. 9. 63, 64) when he received this command.

γεγαμηκώς. Cp. 5. 116.

6. **ἐν τῇ Κιλικίῃ.** Cp. c. 95 *infra*.

10. **τοῖσι μὴ ἀποδεκομένοισι.** This passage has been taken to prove that Hdt. is here answering criticisms passed upon the story of the Debate as told by him 3. 80 ff., and that consequently that portion of his work was written and published before this passage (cp. A. Kirchhoff, *Entstehungszeit*, p. 11). The proof is not conclusive, for in 3. 80 Hdt. remarks expressly that the speeches of Otanes and the others were regarded by some persons as incredible and unauthentic: he is answering the critics already there, and their critique need not have been directed against his own work in the first instance. The remark there is, indeed, farther-reaching than the remark here: there he defends all the speeches, here he refers only to the bare thesis of Otanes. As far then as this point is concerned this passage might have been written before the passage in Bk. 3. Cp. Introduction, p. xciv.

13. **δημοκρατίας.** The connexion

ποιήσας ἠπείγετο ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον. ὡς δὲ συνελέχθη μὲν χρῆμα πολλὸν νεῶν συνελέχθη δὲ καὶ πεζὸς στρατὸς πολλός, διαβάντες τῇσι νηυσὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἐπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς
44 *Εὐρώπης, ἐπορεύοντο δὲ ἐπί τε Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας. αὗται μὲν ὦν σφι πρόσχημα ἦσαν τοῦ στόλου· ἀτὰρ ἐν νόῳ ἔχοντες ὅσας ἂν πλείστας δύνωνται καταστρέφεσθαι τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πολίων, τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τῇσι νηυσὶ Θασίους οὐδὲ χεῖρας ἀνταειραμένους κατεστρέψαντο, τοῦτο δὲ τῷ πεζῷ Μακεδόνας πρὸς τοῖσι ὑπάρχουσι δούλους προσεκτήσαντο· τὰ γὰρ ἐντὸς Μακεδόνων*

---

here posited between the political reform of Mardonios for Ionia in 492 B.C., and the supposed programme of Otanes for Persia in 521 B.C., so far from lending colour to the latter, reinforces the suspicion that Herodotus — who was not a Hallam or a Stubbs—has misunderstood the real or supposed action of Mardonios on this occasion. It is possible that the supposed 'democracies' of Mardonios are little more than the 'liberties of jurisdiction' of Artaphrenes c. 42. It is, however, more probable that a further reform, perhaps dictated by the king and enforced by Mardonios, was made in the local government of Ionia. The monarchical city-governors may have been set aside in favour of elective magistrates, councils, and so forth. Oligarchy and the oligarchs were at this time anti-medic in Ionia (see c. 14 *supra*). The democratic tyrannis had not shown itself perfectly trustworthy, at least in the case of Miletos, and the Persian satraps and generals may have been jealous of the city despots. It is, however, to be observed that the tyrannis is still found afterwards in the Greek cities subject to Persia (c. 25 *supra*, 7. 98 f., 8. 132) and *πάντας* is plainly an exaggeration. Hdt. obviously misconceives the act ascribed to Mardonios as well as its motive and results. From his own point of view his argument would have been stronger if Gobryas, not Otanes, had been the reputed advocate of democracy; but Gobryas and his house were probably too closely connected with the king to make that possible.

15. **χρῆμα πολλόν.** Cp. *χρῆμα π. ἀρδίων* 4. 81, *χ. π. νεῶν καὶ πεζὸς στρατὸς πολλός*, cp. *πολλὸν μὲν κάρτα πεζὸν ἅμα ἀγόμενος πολλὸν δὲ ναυτικὸν supra*, vague estimates which indicate the poverty of the genuine tradition, the lack of official records.

17. **Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας.** It may fairly be doubted whether Athens and Eretria were as yet the ostensible or even the secret 'objective' of the Persian movements. Hippias was not with Mardonios. (Thrace and Macedon, which had evidently used the opportunity of the Ionian revolt to throw off the Persian yoke, were likely to cost a campaign or two.) Cp. 7. 157.

44. 2. **πρόσχημα** (cp. 4. 167, in a different sense 5. 28). The account of the *πρόσχημα* and the real intentions of the Persians recalls 7. 157, and emphasises the anachronism. The king might very well meditate the reduction of Thasos without issuing a carte-blanche for the conquest of Hellas or of Europe. In any case, Thasos was an obvious stepping-stone, if not the very next step, westwards. Its reduction had been already attempted if not accomplished by Histiaios, and he had raised the blockade at the approach of the Phoenicians, c. 28 *supra*.

5. **Μακεδόνας.** This summary account of the reduction of Macedon is surprising in the light of the story above (5. 17-21) concerning the previous incorporation of Macedon, in the days of Amyntas. Nothing has been said of any revolt or secession of Macedon in the interval: nothing is said of any heroism of Alexander on this occasion though he is now on the throne. It might be that with years Alexander had learnt wisdom, or changed his policy: but it may be that the story above is fictitious, or at least grossly exaggerated. See notes *ad l.*

6. **ἐντὸς Μακεδόνων**, *i.e.* east or Macedon. Hdt. writes here from the Asiatic or Persian point of view, geographically: but this cannot be taken

ἔθνεα πάντα σφι ἦν ἤδη ὑποχείρια γεγονότα. ἐκ μὲν δὴ Θάσου διαβαλόντες πέρην ὑπὸ τὴν ἤπειρον ἐκομίζοντο μέχρι Ἀκάνθου, ἐκ δὲ Ἀκάνθου ὁρμώμενοι τὸν Ἄθων περιέβαλλον. ἐπιπεσὼν δέ σφι περιπλέουσι βορέης ἄνεμος μέγας τε καὶ ἄπορος κάρτα τρηχέως περιέσπε, πλήθεϊ πολλὰς τῶν νεῶν ἐκβάλλων πρὸς τὸν Ἄθων. λέγεται γὰρ τριηκοσίας μὲν τῶν νεῶν τὰς διαφθαρείσας εἶναι, ὑπὲρ δὲ δύο μυριάδας ἀνθρώπων. ὥστε γὰρ θηριωδεστάτης ἐούσης τῆς θαλάσσης ταύτης τῆς περὶ τὸν Ἄθων, οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων διεφθείροντο ἁρπαζόμενοι, οἱ δὲ πρὸς τὰς πέτρας ἀρασσόμενοι· οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν νέειν οὐκ ἐπιστέατο καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο
διεφθείροντο, οἱ δὲ ῥίγεϊ. ὁ μὲν δὴ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς οὕτω 45
ἔπρησσε, Μαρδονίῳ δὲ καὶ τῷ πεζῷ στρατοπεδευομένῳ ἐν Μακεδονίῃ νυκτὸς Βρύγοι Θρήικες ἐπεχείρησαν· καί σφεων πολλοὺς φονεύουσι οἱ Βρύγοι, Μαρδόνιον δὲ αὐτὸν τρωματίζουσι. οὐ μέντοι οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ δουλοσύνην διέφυγον πρὸς Περσέων· οὐ γὰρ δὴ πρότερον ἀπανέστη ἐκ τῶν χωρέων τουτέων Μαρδόνιος πρὶν ἤ σφεας ὑποχειρίους ἐποιήσατο. τούτους μέντοι καταστρεψάμενος ἀπῆγε τὴν στρατιὴν ὀπίσω, ἅτε τῷ πεζῷ τε προσπταίσας πρὸς τοὺς Βρύγους καὶ τῷ ναυτικῷ μεγάλως περὶ Ἄθων. οὗτος μέν νυν ὁ στόλος αἰσχρῶς ἀγωνισάμενος ἀπαλλάχθη ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην.

---

to prove that he is drawing from an Asiatic source. The frontier of Macedon is not here exactly marked, but it looks as though it were advanced to the Strymon. Cp. c. 45 *infra*.

11. **τρηχέως περιέσπε**, *sc.* αὐτούς. Cp. 5. 1 *supra*.

12. **λέγεται**: by whom? Anyway Hdt. discredits the figures (cp. 4. 184). These exacter estimates are not worth much more than the vaguer above; but might be taken to imply that the forces of Mardonios amounted to the regulation 600 vessels, and to some 200,000 men. Cp. c. 95 *infra*, 7. 113.

16. **νέειν οὐκ ἐπιστέατο**. Cp. 8. 89.

45. 2. **ἐν Μακεδονίῃ**. The E. frontier of Macedonia was formed by Dysoron, cp. 5. 17. The **Βρύγοι** are Phrygians, cp. 7. 73. The topographical indications here do not admit of exact determination. (Cp. Giseke, *Thrakisch-Pelasgische Stämme*, note 41.)

4. **αὐτὸν τρωματίζουσι**. This wound, if historic, might account for Mardonios's retirement at the end of the campaign, which in the text seems to be ascribed to his 'disgraceful' defeat. Cp. Appendix VI. § 3.

10. **αἰσχρῶς ἀγωνισάμενος**. That the fleet suffered severely in the storm off Athos may be regarded as certain. With that exception, which was hardly a disgrace, the expedition of 492 B.C. was a brilliant success. It had cost four or five campaigns to quell the Ionians and recover Miletos. One summer was sufficient for the conquest or recapture of Thrace and Macedon, and the addition of the wealthy Thasos to the empire. Hdt. with more justice elsewhere (7. 9 α) allows Mardonios to claim credit for the operations of this year, which, as Hdt. himself acknowledges (7. 108), were substantially successful. Such inconsequences in the record viewed as a whole illustrate the vitiated and 'pragmatic' character of the author's discrepant sources, and show that he himself was not careful to introduce a complete harmony, which could only have been attained by still more unscrupulous pragmatism. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.

46 Δευτέρῳ δὲ ἔτεϊ τούτων ὁ Δαρεῖος πρῶτα μὲν Θασίους,
διαβληθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστυγειτόνων ὡς ἀπόστασιν μηχανῴατο,
πέμψας ἄγγελον ἐκέλευέ σφεας τὸ τεῖχος περιαιρέειν καὶ τὰς
νέας ἐς Ἄβδηρα κομίζειν. οἱ γὰρ δὴ Θάσιοι, οἷα ὑπὸ Ἱστιαίου
τε τοῦ Μιλησίου πολιορκηθέντες καὶ προσόδων ἐουσέων μεγαλέων,
ἐχρέωντο τοῖσι χρήμασι νέας τε ναυπηγεύμενοι μακρὰς καὶ τεῖχος
ἰσχυρότερον περιβαλλόμενοι. ἡ δὲ πρόσοδός σφι ἐγίνετο ἔκ τε
τῆς ἠπείρου καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μετάλλων· ἐκ μέν γε τῶν ἐκ Σκαπτη-
σύλης τῶν χρυσέων μετάλλων τὸ ἐπίπαν ὀγδώκοντα τάλαντα
προσήιε, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ Θάσῳ ἐλάσσω μὲν τούτων, συχνὰ
δὲ οὕτω ὥστε τὸ ἐπίπαν Θασίοισι ἐοῦσι καρπῶν ἀτελέσι προσήιε
ἀπό τε τῆς ἠπείρου καὶ τῶν μετάλλων ἔτεος ἑκάστου διηκόσια
47 τάλαντα, ὅτε δὲ τὸ πλεῖστον προσῆλθε, τριηκόσια. εἶδον δὲ
καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ μέταλλα ταῦτα, καὶ μακρῷ ἦν αὐτῶν θωμασιώτατα

---

46. 1. **δευτέρῳ ἔτεϊ**, next year, *i.e.* 491-0 B.C., cp. c. 42 *supra*.

Θασίους. This need for fresh demands on Thasos after its surrender in the previous year is remarkable. Mardonios, or rather the fleet, incorporates Thasos in the empire without striking a blow, and yet in the very next year the dismantling of the fortifications, the surrender of the fleet, are demanded of the Thasians, as securities against their rebellion. Such a course of affairs is not, of course, impossible: but in view of the obvious fact that the story of Mardonios's expedition in 492 B.C. (cc. 43-45) is apparently drawn from a single source, while the passage (cc. 46, 47) shows the marks of a wholly distinct origin, especially in the autobiographical and local details, it is fair to suspect that in the two passages on the treatment of Thasos we have two different accounts of one set of events to be dated 492 B.C., and that the annals of 491 B.C. only begin with c. 48. Cp. Appendix VI. § 4.

2. **ἀστυγείτονες**, perhaps Abdera, which was evidently loyal to the king. Cp. 7. 120, 8. 120.

4. **Ἄβδηρα.** The name is probably Phoenician. (Cp. Grassberger, *Studien*, p. 233.) There was a Carthaginian or Phoenician colony of the same name in Baetica. The Abdera in Thrace was, according to tradition, Hellenised from Klazomenae and recolonised by the Teians about 541 B.C., 1. 168. But the coins are of the Phoenician standard, which points to the early existence of a Phoenician emporium *in situ*. (Cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 219.) The proximity of the Phoenicians in Thasos, and elsewhere, confirms the Phoenician character of the first settlement.

Ἱστιαίου, c. 28 *supra*, in 493 B.C.

8. **Σκαπτησύλης.** Thucydides the historian had, perhaps, a connexion with this place. Cp. Marcell. *vit.* §§ 15-19, Thuc. 4. 104. Scaptesyle was not the only but the principal source of Thasian external revenue.

11. **καρπῶν ἀτελέσι**, *i.e.* when free from the exactions of Persians—or of Athenians. At the time when Hdt. visited Thasos the island was presumably tributary to Athens. Cp. Thuc. 1. 100 f.

13. **τριηκόσια.** The passage of Xerxes cost them 400 T., 7. 118. The highest assessment of Thasos in the Athenian tribute-lists amounts to 30 T., or apparently a tithe of the maximum revenue of the island.

47. 1. **εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτός.** Thasos (which is at present a dependency of Egypt) has been little visited by modern travellers, but Mr. Bent conducted some excavations there (see *J. H. S.* vol. viii. 1887), and Mr. Tozer more recently visited the island; see *Islands of the Aegean*, cc. xiv, xv. None of the inscriptions found are as early as the time of Hdt.'s visit (cp. 2. 44 and see Jacob's *Thasiaca*, 1893, p. 24).

2. **τὰ μέταλλα ταῦτα** applies ap-

τὰ οἱ Φοίνικες ἀνεῦρον οἱ μετὰ Θάσου κτίσαντες τὴν νῆσον ταύτην, ἥτις νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θάσου τούτου τοῦ Φοίνικος τὸ οὔνομα ἔσχε. τὰ δὲ μέταλλα τὰ Φοινικικὰ ταῦτα ἐστι τῆς Θάσου μεταξὺ Αἰνύρων τε χώρου καλεομένου καὶ Κοινύρων, ἀντίον δὲ Σαμοθρηίκης, ὄρος μέγα ἀνεστραμμένον ἐν τῇ ζητήσι. τοῦτο μέν νυν ἐστι τοιοῦτον. οἱ δὲ Θάσιοι τῷ βασιλέι κελεύσαντι καὶ τὸ τεῖχος τὸ σφέτερον κατεῖλον καὶ τὰς νέας τὰς πάσας ἐκόμισαν ἐς Ἄβδηρα.

48 Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἀπεπειρᾶτο ὁ Δαρεῖος τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὅ τι ἐν νόῳ ἔχοιεν, κότερα πολεμέειν ἑωυτῷ ἢ παραδιδόναι σφέας αὐτούς. διέπεμπε ὦν κήρυκας ἄλλους ἄλλῃ τάξας ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, κελεύων αἰτέειν βασιλέι γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. τούτους μὲν δὴ ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔπεμπε, ἄλλους δὲ κήρυκας διέπεμπε ἐς τὰς ἑωυτοῦ

---

parently to the mines in the island of Thasos only. The passage proves of course a visit to Thasos, but unfortunately does not enable us to date it: Hdt. can hardly have seen the island before the Athenian conquest in 463 B.C., but might have been there any time during the next twenty years, perhaps on the voyage to the Pontos. Cp. Introduction, pp. xciii., xcv. f. The Phoenicians are here again exalted at the expense of the Ionians. Cp. 7. 23.

3. **Θάσου.** The Phoenician occupants of Thasos were from Tyre (2. 44), and Hdt. dates the occupation five generations before the birth of Hellenic Herakles, a date based upon the genealogies, cp. 4. 147, 5. 59 f. The subsequent Hellenic colonists were Parians (Thuc. 4. 104, 4). Their oekist was Telesikles, father of Archilochos the Iambist, Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 5. 33, 6. 7 (ed. Teubn. vol. i. pp. 261, 293), and the Parian occupation may be dated to the last quarter of the 8th century B.C. Cp. Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* i. *ad ann.* 720, and 708; and cp. 1. 12. The old name of Thasos was said to be Aëria (cp. 'Kalliste' as the old name of Thera 4. 147 *supra*, which Thasos "the most beautiful island in the Aegean" (Tozer) would better have deserved). There was a town in Africa named Θασία (Ptol. 4. 3, 3), and a district in Spain named Thasie (Plin. 6. 10, 5), and Hdt. says that in Tyre was a temple of 'Thasian' Herakles, 2. 44. The name appears to be cognate to Tarsus (Θαρσός, Joseph. *A. J.* 1. 6), Tarshish, Tartessos, *et sim.*, and has presumably a Phoenician origin. The personification of 'Thasos' is, however, doubtless a Greek conceit.

6. **Αἰνύρων . . Κοινύρων.** The latter name (Kinira) still clings to the district, the former has disappeared (Tozer, *op. c.* p. 306). Mr. Tozer was unable to find Hdt.'s mountain, or the mines. But presumably further exploration would yield better results.

7. **Σαμοθρηίκης.** Samothrace, reputed a colony of the Samians (cp. V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseud.* pp. 523 f. fr. 530) once upon a time in possession of 'Pelasgi' (cp. 2. 51 and c. 137 *infra*), lies E.-S.-E. of Thasos, and rises to a height of 5248 ft., cp. Tozer, *op. c.* p. 346.

ὄρος κτλ. Hdt.'s astonishment is too much for his grammar. Cp. c. 30 *supra*.

48. 1. **μετὰ δέ.** Still in this same year 491 B.C. Cp. c. 95 *infra*.

ἀπεπειρᾶτο. Cp. Παυσανίης δὲ ἀπεπειρᾶτο τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἴ τινες ἐθέλοιεν κτλ. 9. 21. Thucydides uses the active voice (cp. L. & S.).

3. **Ἑλλάδα.** Hellas includes islands, see *infra*, and cp. 1. 27.

5. **κήρυκας.** It is characteristic of Hdt.'s methods that we learn nothing here of the wonderful story of the treatment of those Heralds at Sparta and Athens, which now follows, 7. 133 ff. It is hardly conceivable that the story should have been omitted here unless the author had (1) already committed it to writing, or (2) not yet acquired it. Part at least of the story of the μῆνις Ταλθυβίου is obviously later

δασμοφόρους πόλιας τὰς παραθαλασσίους, κελεύων νέας τε μα-
49 κρὰς καὶ ἱππαγωγὰ πλοῖα ποιέεσθαι. οὗτοί τε δὴ παρεσκευάζοντο ταῦτα, καὶ τοῖσι ἥκουσι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα κήρυξι πολλοὶ μὲν ἠπειρωτέων ἔδοσαν τὰ προΐσχετο αἰτέων ὁ Πέρσης, πάντες δὲ νησιῶται ἐς τοὺς ἀπικοίατο αἰτήσοντες. οἵ τε δὴ ἄλλοι νησιῶται διδοῦσι γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ Δαρείῳ καὶ δὴ καὶ Αἰγινῆται. ποιήσασι δέ σφι ταῦτα ἰθέως Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεκέατο, δοκέοντές τε ἐπὶ σφίσι ἐπέχοντας τοὺς Αἰγινήτας δεδωκέναι ὡς ἅμα τῷ Πέρσῃ ἐπὶ σφέας στρατεύωνται, καὶ ἄσμενοι προφάσιος ἐπελάβοντο, φοιτέοντές τε ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην κατηγόρεον τῶν Αἰγι-
50 νητέων τὰ πεποιήκοιεν προδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα. πρὸς ταύτην δὲ τὴν κατηγορίην Κλεομένης ὁ Ἀναξανδρίδεω βασιλεὺς ἐὼν Σπαρτιητέων διέβη ἐς Αἴγιναν, βουλόμενος συλλαβεῖν Αἰγινητέων τοὺς αἰτιωτάτους. ὡς δὲ ἐπειρᾶτο συλλαμβάνων, ἄλλοι τε δὴ ἐγίνοντο αὐτῷ ἀντίξοοι τῶν Αἰγινητέων, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Κριὸς ὁ Πολυκρίτου μάλιστα, ὃς οὐκ ἔφη αὐτὸν οὐδένα ἄξειν χαίροντα Αἰγινητέων· ἄνευ γάρ μιν Σπαρτιητέων τοῦ κοινοῦ ποιέειν ταῦτα, ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἀναγνωσθέντα χρήμασι· ἅμα γὰρ ἄν μιν τῷ ἑτέρῳ βασιλέι ἐλθόντα συλλαμβάνειν. ἔλεγε δὲ ταῦτα ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς τῆς Δημαρήτου. Κλεομένης δὲ ἀπελαυνόμενος ἐκ τῆς Αἰγίνης εἴρετο τὸν Κριὸν ὅ τι οἱ εἴη τὸ οὔνομα·

---

than 430 B.C. (cp. 7. 137; Thuc. 2. 67). Cp. Appendix VII. § 11.

6. **πόλιας τὰς παραθαλασσίους** taken literally must include Greek cities, and there were Ionians and Aeolians (what, no Dorians ?) in the command of Datis, c. 98 *infra*. Cp. 7. 89-95.

49. 2. **πολλοὶ μὲν ἠπειρωτέων.** There is perhaps some exaggeration here. The Heralds may have been received in Thessaly, Boeotia (at Delphi ?), at Argos, but there is a suspicious generality about the assertion.

4. **νησιῶται.** Samos (c. 25 *supra*), Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos (c. 31 *supra*), Thasos (c. 47 *supra*) have been accounted for. Probably we shall be safe in concluding that Lemnos, Imbros (Samothrace), Paros, imitated or anticipated the prudence of Thasos and Aigina. The inhabitants of Naxos (c. 96 *infra*) and Delos (c. 97 *infra*) hardly act like subjects secure of protection: but the account of Delos in particular is not free from suspicion.

6. **Ἀθηναῖοι.** This appeal by Athens to Sparta in the summer of 491 B.C. against Aigina is a notable recognition by the Athenian Democracy of the Spartan *Prostasia*. If it was made on the suggestion of Themistokles, perhaps one of the Strategi elected in 490 B.C., it would have been of a piece with his action and policy ten years later. The story of Themistokles and Krios and 'the Medism of the Aiginetans,' 8. 92, supports this hypothesis. But perhaps on this occasion Miltiades was the leading spirit.

50. 2. **Κλεομένης ὁ Ἀ. β. ἐ. Σ.** The elaborate description of Kleomenes here would appear to be due to one, or more, of three causes: (1) Hdt. preserves the superfluous detail from his source; or (2) does not expect his narrative to be redd, or listened to, continuously; or (3) wishes to add emphasis, and to heighten the effects of the king's reintroduction.

10. **ἀπελαυνόμενος.** Cp. 5. 94. The fact that Kleomenes retires from Aigina to return with the other king and claim the hostages (c. 73 *infra*) implies that he admitted the technical validity of the objection of Krios. The story not only ignores the law established

ὁ δέ οἱ τὸ ἐὸν ἔφρασε. ὁ δὲ Κλεομένης πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη "ἤδη νῦν καταχαλκοῦ ὦ κριὲ τὰ κέρεα, ὡς συνοισόμενος μεγάλῳ κακῷ."

Ἐν δὲ τῇ Σπάρτῃ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ὑπομένων Δημάρητος 51
ὁ Ἀρίστωνος διέβαλλε τὸν Κλεομένεα, ἐὼν βασιλεὺς καὶ οὗτος Σπαρτιητέων, οἰκίης δὲ τῆς ὑποδεεστέρης, κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ὑποδεεστέρης· ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γεγόνασι· κατὰ πρεσβυγενείην δέ κως

---

according to Hdt. 5. 75 about fifteen years, but is suspicious in itself, since there would be other ways of convincing the Aiginetans that the king was not acting *ultra vires* or without a commission, and it is not likely that Kleomenes made his appearance in Aigina absolutely alone. The story is hardly from an Athenian source. The stress laid upon the Athenian recognition of the Spartan προστασία, the witticism of Kleomenes, are not points on which Athenian tradition would insist. Nor is it likely from the turn of expression (προδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα) that the Aiginetans preserved the story of their own disgrace. Demaratos does not come well out of the story, or it might have been traced to that 'Pergamene' source, from which probably several of Hdt.'s anecdotes about Demaratos were derived. (Cp. c. 70 *infra*, Xenophon, *Hell.* 3. 1, 6, Pausanias 3. 7, 7.) The most obvious hypothesis remaining is that the story is from Spartan sources, in the first or second degree: albeit a Delphic tradition seems also a possible authority. (Cp. cc. 66, 75, 5. 89.) See Appendix VIII. §§ 4, 5.

51. 1. **τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον**, *i.e.* during the absence of Kleomenes in Aigina, summer of 491 B.C. The narrative is, however, at once interrupted by an excursus upon the origin of dual royalty at Sparta, and is not resumed until c. 61 *infra*.

Δημάρητος ὁ Ἀρίστωνος. Already mentioned 5. 75.

2. **διέβαλλε**, 5. 96, etc.

3. **ὑποδεεστέρης.** The inferior dignity, if not power, of the Prokleid house is here clearly asserted. That the two houses were descended from the twin sons of Aristodemos and Argeia may be regarded as an aetiological fiction to account for the duality of the kingship at Sparta. According to universally received tradition the Spartans were Dorians, while their kings of both houses were Achaians. This tradition, like many others, looks like a legend to give the Dorian conquerors a better title to the soil. (Cp. 1. 67, 68, 7. 159.) But in no degree does it account for the dual kingship. Feeling a difficulty in believing that the Dorian invaders had no leaders or chieftains of their own stock, some modern critics have supposed that the royal houses were both Dorian and represented the fusion of two independent Dorian communities (so Duncker, *G. des Alt.* v.[5] 254). Against this view may be urged the objections that it involves the existence of a second Dorian settlement in Laconia, that it ignores the 'Achaian' claim of the kings, and the undoubtedly Achaian, or at least prae-Dorian and anti-Dorian, elements in Spartan institutions and society. The most reasonable hypothesis seems to be that one of the royal houses was non-Dorian, and the other Dorian, and that in the dual kingship was preserved a monument of the compromise upon which the historic Spartan state was founded. No other theory so well explains the popularity of royalty at Sparta, its duality, its Achaian claim, and the constant feud of the houses. It was popular, for in it was represented the traditions and interests of a majority of the population. It was dual, because the Dorian house was not dethroned, though the Achaian house was recognised as 'the elder.' Dorian oligarchs would not be anxious to aggrandise a monarch even of their own stock. The Achaian claim was half or more than half justified, though the kings of the 'elder' house may have been most conscious of it (cp. 5. 72 *supra*). The Dorian house was absorbed into the Herakleid pedigree: the 'twin' theory, put forward to explain the duality of the kingship, effaced the alien origin of the 'younger'

52 *τετίμηται μᾶλλον ἢ Εὐρυσθένεος. Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ ὁμολογέοντες οὐδενὶ ποιητῇ λέγουσι αὐτὸν Ἀριστόδημον τὸν Ἀριστομάχου τοῦ Κλεοδαίου τοῦ Ὕλλου βασιλεύοντα ἀγαγεῖν σφέας ἐς ταύτην τὴν χώρην τὴν νῦν ἐκτέαται, ἀλλ' οὐ τοὺς Ἀριστοδήμου παῖδας. μετὰ δὲ χρόνον οὐ πολλὸν Ἀριστοδήμῳ τεκεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα, τῇ οὔνομα εἶναι Ἀργείην· θυγατέρα δὲ αὐτὴν λέγουσι εἶναι Αὐτεσίωνος τοῦ Τισαμενοῦ τοῦ Θερσάνδρου τοῦ Πολυνείκεος· ταύτην δὴ τεκεῖν δίδυμα, ἐπιδόντα δὲ τὸν Ἀριστόδημον τὰ τέκνα νούσῳ τελευτᾶν. Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ τοὺς τότε ἐόντας βουλεῦσαι κατὰ νόμον βασιλέα τῶν παίδων τὸν πρεσβύτερον ποιήσασθαι. οὔκων δή σφεας ἔχειν ὁκότερον ἕλωνται ὥστε καὶ ὁμοίων καὶ ἴσων ἐόντων· οὐ δυναμένους δὲ γνῶναι, ἢ καὶ πρὸ τούτου, ἐπειρωτᾶν τὴν τεκοῦσαν. τὴν δὲ οὐδὲ αὐτὴν φάναι*

---

house. If this theory is to be rejected, there will be something to be said for regarding the Achaian (*i.e.* non-Dorian) descent of both houses as historical. There is nothing strange in the belief that the Dorians were under non-Dorian leaders and kings: how many reigning houses at the present day are of the same stock as their subjects? If it be said, the present state of Europe is the result of a long and complicated history, it may be answered that the Peloponnesos was highly civilised, and had a long history behind it, when the barbarous Dorian spearmen swept into the land, and overthrew government and culture. The term Achaian is used above without prejudice: cp. 5. 72, 4. 147 ff. For modern literature on the subject, see Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.² 546, K. F. Hermann's *Lehrbuch*, i.⁶ 158 ff.

52. 2. **λέγουσι.** One might suppose that Hdt. heard this story in Lakedaimon itself (cp. 3. 55), but the formula is an open one (cp. Introduction, § 20), and its application here does not favour the assumption that Hdt. was the first prose author to commit the Lakedaimonian story to writing. The 'Lakedaimonian' tradition is the prose tradition which Hdt. may have read in a prose authority. We can hardly admit (*vide* Bähr, *ad l.*) that Hdt. collected the various local traditions about Lakonia, much less that all such traditions agreed in contradicting the 'poets.' Bähr remarks that the poetic version is followed by Pausan. 3. 1, 5.

3. **Ὕλλου**, son of Herakles. Cp. 7. 204, 8. 131.

4. **νῦν** unfortunately throws no light upon the date of Hdt.'s composition. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

6. **Ἀργείην.** Argeia is no Dorian either, but of 'Kadmeian' lineage, Polyneikes being son of Oidipus, and so on back to Kadmos. Cp. 4. 147, 5. 59, 60 *supra*. Her brother is Theras, eponym of Thera, 4. 147.

8. **ἐπιδόντα**, 'lived to see.' Cp. L. & S. *sub v.* *ἐπεῖδον*, qu. Xen. *Vect.* 6, where, however, *ἐφ' ἡμῶν* occurs. *ἐπιδόντα* here seems to carry an acknowledgment of the twins as his sons.

9. **τοὺς τότε**: *ἐν τέλεϊ ἐόντας* (Stein): but the authorities could not act without the commons: cp. c. 56 *infra*. According to 4. 147, Theras *ἐπιτροπαίην εἶχε*.

10. **κατὰ νόμον.** This *νόμος* held good between brothers of the same house, cp. 5. 42, although, if Demaratos be made to speak truly to Xerxes 7. 3, it was subject to a curious qualification, which might often cut out the eldest-born.

12. **ὁμοίων καὶ ἴσων.** The first term refers rather to appearance or quality, the second to quantity or strength. But they have an odd effect used of infants, and a savour of the political jargon of Agora or Lesche. Van Herwerden would reverse the order of the words.

ἢ καὶ πρὸ τούτου. A transparent bit of rationalism, which should be illuminative of other less obvious instances. Van Herwerden brackets it; but Hdt. sometimes rationalises.

13. **αὐτήν.** The case carries on the

διαγινώσκειν. εἰδυῖαν μὲν καὶ τὸ κάρτα λέγειν ταῦτα, βουλομένην δὲ εἴ κως ἀμφότεροι γενοίατο βασιλέες. τοὺς ὦν δὴ Λακεδαιμονίους ἀπορέειν, ἀπορέοντας δὲ πέμπειν ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐπειρησομένους ὅ τι χρήσωνται τῷ πρήγματι. τὴν δὲ Πυθίην σφέας κελεύειν ἀμφότερα τὰ παιδία ἡγήσασθαι βασιλέας, τιμᾶν δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν γεραίτερον. τὴν μὲν δὴ Πυθίην ταῦτά σφι ἀνελεῖν, τοῖσι δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἀπορέουσι οὐδὲν ἧσσον ὅκως ἐξεύρωσι αὐτῶν τὸν πρεσβύτερον, ὑποθέσθαι ἄνδρα Μεσσήνιον τῷ οὔνομα εἶναι Πανίτην· ὑποθέσθαι δὲ τοῦτον τὸν Πανίτην τάδε τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι, φυλάξαι τὴν γειναμένην ὁκότερον τῶν παίδων πρότερον λούει καὶ σιτίζει· καὶ ἢν μὲν κατὰ ταὐτὰ φαίνηται αἰεὶ ποιεῦσα, τοὺς δὲ πᾶν ἕξειν ὅσον τι καὶ δίζηνται καὶ θέλουσι ἐξευρεῖν, ἢν δὲ πλανᾶται καὶ ἐκείνη ἐναλλὰξ ποιεῦσα, δῆλά σφι ἔσεσθαι ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνη πλέον οὐδὲν οἶδε, ἐπ' ἄλλην τε τραπέσθαι σφέας ὁδόν. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ τοὺς Σπαρτιήτας κατὰ τὰς τοῦ Μεσσηνίου ὑποθήκας φυλάξαντας τὴν μητέρα τῶν Ἀριστοδήμου παίδων λαβεῖν κατὰ ταὐτὰ τιμῶσαν τὸν πρότερον καὶ σίτοισι καὶ λουτροῖσι, οὐκ εἰδυῖαν τῶν εἵνεκεν ἐφυλάσσετο. λαβόντας δὲ τὸ παιδίον τὸ τιμώμενον πρὸς τῆς γειναμένης ὡς ἐὸν πρότερον τρέφειν ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ· καί οἱ οὔνομα τεθῆναι Εὐρυσθένεα, τῷ δὲ Προκλέα. τούτους ἀνδρωθέντας αὐτούς τε ἀδελφεοὺς ἐόντας

---

obliquity of the main sentence, otherwise we should have *ἡ δὲ οὐδὲ αὐτὴ ἔφη διαγινώσκειν.*

14. **εἰδυῖαν . . τὸ κάρτα,** 'knowing perfectly well.' (1. 191 *τὸ κάρτα ἐπύθοντο,* 'they knew only too well.') Cobet inserts *οὐ* before *βουλομένην.*

17. **κελεύειν.** The duality of the kingship is here referred to Delphic direction, as are the reforms of Lykurgos in 1. 65. Not *βασιλέας* but *ἀρχαγέτας* was probably the Spartan term. Cp. the *Rhetra,* Plutarch, *Lyc.* 6, but the technical word would not fit the verse.

18. **τιμᾶν.** Stein, following K. O. Müller, suggests that the word in the oracle was *γεραίρειν.* (The verse might have ended: *μᾶλλον δὲ γεραίτερον ἔστι γεραίρειν.*) The word is found 5. 67 in the same sentence as *τιμᾶν: τά τε δὴ ἄλλα οἱ Σικυώνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν Ἄδρηστον καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον* . . . The honours of the Spartan kings also included *χοροί* and *θυσίαι* from the first. Cp. Thuc. 5. 16 of the restoration of Pleistoanax: *τοῖς ὁμοίοις χοροῖς καὶ θυσίαις . . ὥσπερ ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον Λακεδαίμονα κτίζοντες τοὺς βασιλέας καθίσταντο.* Delphi establishes the principle of the dual kingship, but leaves the question of primogeniture undecided. This was settled by a device and observation which, had it been sooner thought of, would equally have settled the major question of the sole succession! Thus the story well-nigh refutes itself.

22. **Πανίτην.** Of Panites the Messenian there seems to be no other mention. The Spartans have often to go outside their own ranks for good advice, cp. 9. 9. Whether this 'Messenian' is to be considered a 'Dorian' is not clear.

25. **τοὺς δέ.** *δὲ in apodosi.*

33. **τρέφειν ἐν τ. δ.** This *τροφή* goes beyond the *τιμή* enjoined; and seems to involve separation from the mother. Was the Eurysthenid always thus brought up at Sparta, or whence the tradition? The total omission of the *rôle* of Theras, Argeia's brother, uncle and guardian of the twins, from this Spartan legend, is significant. Cp. 4. 147 *supra.*

λέγουσι διαφόρους εἶναι τὸν πάντα χρόνον τῆς ζόης ἀλλήλοισι, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τούτων γενομένους ὡσαύτως διατελέειν.

53 Ταῦτα μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι μοῦνοι Ἑλλήνων· τάδε δὲ κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' Ἑλλήνων ἐγὼ γράφω, τούτους τοὺς Δωριέων βασιλέας μέχρι μὲν δὴ Περσέος τοῦ Δανάης, τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεόντος, καταλεγομένους ὀρθῶς ὑπ' Ἑλλήνων καὶ ἀποδεικνυμένους ὡς εἰσι Ἕλληνες· ἤδη γὰρ τηνικαῦτα ἐς Ἕλληνας οὗτοι ἐτέλεον. ἔλεξα δὲ μέχρι Περσέος τοῦδε εἵνεκα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνέκαθεν ἔτι ἔλαβον, ὅτι οὐκ ἔπεστι ἐπωνυμίη Περσέι οὐδεμία πατρὸς θνητοῦ, ὥσπερ Ἡρακλέι Ἀμφιτρύων. ἤδη ὧν

---

35. **διαφόρους.** Cp. Arist. *Pol.* 2. 9, 30, 1271ᵃ *σωτηρίαν ἐνόμιζον τῇ πόλει εἶναι τὸ στασιάζειν τοὺς βασιλεῖς.*

53. 1. **ταῦτα** the preceding, **τάδε** the following. Cp. *ταῦτα, τάδε,* 5. 92 *ad init.* Not that Hdt. is always so strict, cp. 5. 93 *supra.*

2. **τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' Ἑλλήνων ἐγὼ γράφω.** Hdt. must not be understood to say that he is writing this account of the Egyptian origin of the Herakleids from oral tradition (cp. Introduction, pp. liv., lxxvi f.). It originated, perhaps, among Hellenes in Egypt, of whom some were Dorians, or quasi-Dorian. Cp. 2. 178. Yet reminiscences of old connexions with Egypt might have lived on through the Dorian invasion and conquest, and have at least reinforced or prepared the way for the speculations of the Greeks in Egypt under the 26th Dynasty.

Between **γράφω** and **τούτους** Blakesley suspects a lacuna, to be filled in with a complete genealogy, or catalogue of the kings, which would not be identical with the genealogies 7. 204, 8. 131. He also suspects that Hdt. followed Hekataios in this passage. (The *γενεαλογίαι,* cp. Müller, *Frag. Hist. Gr.* i. p. 25.)

3. **Περσέος.** Rawlinson remarks: "It is strange that Hdt. should speak of Perseus as a king of the Dorians." But Hdt. only speaks of Perseus as one of the *ancestors* of the kings of the Dorians. Hdt. is, however, verbally incorrect in saying that the Perseidae in their day were reckoned Hellenes, as the Hellenic name apparently first entered the Peloponnesos with the Dorians. Substantially he may be right: the Perseids were not 'barbarians.' Thucydides, however, has in this matter stated the case more accurately, 1. 3.

8. **θνητοῦ.** Zeus was the father of Perseus. The genealogy of his mother Danaë, daughter of Akrisios, whose forebears were Egyptians (cp. next c.) carried the Perseids back to Egypt. Hdt. only supplies certain links in this chain: Lynkeus and Danaos (2. 91) who establish a dynasty in Argos are ancestors of Perseus. Hdt. treats the Danaid legend, which connected Argos with Egypt, as notorious (cp. 2. 91, 171, 182) and well he might, as there was not only an Epic *Danaïs,* but the dramatists popularised the legend, though the *Supplices* of Aischylos is our only trophy from their labours on this theme. On the other side, neither does Hdt. exhibit the connexion between Perseus and Herakles father of Hyllos. Amphitryon and Alkmene are both Perseids from Argos, one generation removed from Perseus. The Hesiodic *Shield of Herakles* told the story. Herakles had to serve the Perseid Eurystheus, to whom succeeded the Pelopid Atreus, the two being related on the female side (cp. Thuc. 1. 9). Thus the Pelopids, too, were connected with the Perseids and Egypt. (Menelaos in Egypt, 2. 118.) The overthrow of the Pelopid dynasties by the Herakleids (with the help of their Dorian followers) is a return and a recovery, not merely because the Herakleids represent the elder branch of the Perseids, but because Herakles and Hyllos had claimed their rights and been worsted by the younger Perseid Eurystheus. (Consult particularly Grote: Part I. c. 4, and Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* vol. i., especially the table on p. 101.) The kings in Sparta were not

ὀρθῷ λόγῳ χρεωμένῳ μέχρι Περσέος ὀρθῶς εἴρηταί μοι· ἀπὸ
δὲ Δανάης τῆς Ἀκρισίου καταλέγοντι τοὺς ἄνω αἰεὶ πατέρας
αὐτῶν φαινοίατο ἂν ἐόντες οἱ τῶν Δωριέων ἡγεμόνες Αἰ-
γύπτιοι ἰθαγενέες. ταῦτα μέν νυν κατὰ τὰ Ἕλληνες λέγουσι 54
γεγενεηλόγηται· ὡς δὲ ὁ παρὰ Περσέων λόγος λέγεται, αὐτὸς
ὁ Περσεὺς ἐὼν Ἀσσύριος ἐγένετο Ἕλλην, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἱ Περσέος
πρόγονοι· τοὺς δὲ Ἀκρισίου γε πατέρας ὁμολογέοντας κατ'
οἰκηιότητα Περσέι οὐδέν, τούτους δὲ εἶναι, κατά περ Ἕλληνες
λέγουσι, Αἰγυπτίους.

Καὶ ταῦτα μέν νυν περὶ τούτων εἰρήσθω. ὅ τι δὲ ἐόντες 55

---

merely of Perseid and Egyptian origin, but also through Argeia, mother of Eurysthenes and Prokles, have a further connexion with Thebes, and with the (Phoenician) Kadmeans. In fact, if it were not for the intervention of the (Hellenic) Zeus as father first of Perseus and then of Herakles, there would not be much to say for the Hellenic origin of the kings of the Dorians.

9. **ὀρθῷ λόγῳ.** A phrase which like many others is popular and historical before it becomes scientific. Cp. c. 68 *infra*.

54. 2. **ὁ παρὰ Περσέων λόγος λέγεται.** We cannot be sure that these words mean more than that the Persian account was reported to Hdt. or found by him in his authorities. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxix.

3. **Περσεὺς ἐὼν Ἀσσύριος.** The 'Persian' view is that Perseus and his ancestors were 'Assyrians,' and that he was the first of the family to 'become a Hellene.' According to the 'Persian' legend given in 7. 150, Perses, the eponym of the Persians, was a son of Perseus, son of Danaë, and Andromeda, daughter of Kepheus. Kepheus is the son of Belos (7. 61). According to the genealogy in 1. 7, Belos is father of Ninos, and son of Alkaios son of Herakles. This Herakles would be the Asiatic or Tyrian Herakles not the Greek, 2. 44. The Syrian and Assyrian connexion is through Andromeda not Perseus, and the argument in 7. 150 implies the Argive origin of Perseus. That is also the implication of the passage 7. 61. According to the story here Perseus has nothing to say to Danaë or to Akrisios. That the kings or chieftains of the Dorians were really of 'Assyrian' or Egyptian descent is more improbable than that they were of non-Dorian origin. The 'Egyptian' hypothesis was the common Greek view; but the license of conjecture practised by the 'Persians' is an indication of the way in which these stories or genealogies originated or developed. The Egyptian origin of the Herakleids is, perhaps, largely a product of the attempt to connect the Greeks and their civilisation with the oldest and wisest folk of antiquity, of which we have other examples in the Dodona legend, and the Egyptian origin of the Hellenic nomenclature of the Deities, 2. 50, 54 ff. At the same time it should be recognised that not merely tradition but archaeology points to a real intercourse between Egypt and Greece, particularly Argos, long before the days of Psamatik I. (Cp. P. Gardner, *New Chapters in Greek History*, esp. cc. v., vii.) The Phoenicians may have been the carriers and go-betweens in a later 'middle age,' but the probabilities now point more and more to a belief in early movements and intercourse between Europe and Egypt (cp. F. Petrie, *J. H. S.* xii. 199 ff. 1891), though it is not at present credible that any Egyptian dynasty was established in Greece. So freely, in fact, were these obscure but real connexions handled by the contemporaries of Herodotus that Argos itself was made the ancestral home of the Danaids, whose advent there is consequently a return to their native land (Aischylos, *Supp.* 15 ff.). Cp. Hdt. 1. 1, where Io is at home in Argos. Io is the mother of Epaphos (cp. 3. 27) from whom Aigyptos and Danaos are descended.

Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ ὅ τι ἀποδεξάμενοι ἔλαβον τὰς Δωριέων βασιληίας, ἄλλοισι γὰρ περὶ αὐτῶν εἴρηται, ἐάσομεν αὐτά· τὰ δὲ ἄλλοι οὐ
56 κατελάβοντο, τούτων μνήμην ποιήσομαι. γέρεά τε δὴ τάδε τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι Σπαρτιῆται δεδώκασι, ἱρωσύνας δύο, Διός τε Λακε-

---

2. **τὰς Δωριέων βασιληίας.** In Sparta, Argos, Messenia, and perhaps Corinth and Sikyon.

3. **ἄλλοισι.** Whether Hdt. here refers to poets, or to prose authors, or to both, in any case this passage might seem to indicate that one of the canons for his own work was to avoid repetition of stories which had already received literary treatment. Such a canon could not, however, be rigidly observed (cp. c. 137 *infra*) and such an inference would be misleading, cp. Introduction, pp. lxxxiii f. The chief story here omitted is the legend of the expulsion and return of the Herakleids, cp. 9. 26. See Grote, Pt. I. c. xvii. § 1 (vol. i. 440-452, ed. 1872). Busolt, i.[2] 205 note [2] for reff. That story had perhaps been treated in the Epic poem *Aigimios;* but cp. Bergk, *Lit. Gesch.* i. 1006 f. and Bethe, in Pauly, *R.-E.* i.[2] 963.

56. 1. **γέρεα.** The notable passage which follows on the *γέρεα* of the Spartan kings (cc. 56, 57, 58) can hardly be considered as complete or accurate, and might, perhaps, have been better arranged. It was, however, as the author has just asserted, the first essay upon the subject. The scheme in Hdt.'s mind apparently divided itself under the heads of privileges: (A) before death, (B) after death. (A) is subdivided into privileges, (1) in war, (2) in peace (van Herwerden would bracket *τὰ εἰρηναῖα* c. 57 *infra* as a gloss). (B) is not sub-classified. The most direct parallel to this passage is supplied by Xenophon, *Rep. Lacd.* cc. xiii., xv.

2. **Σπαρτιῆται δεδώκασι** seems to imply that these *γέρεα* were of positive institution (contrast *δέδοται* c. 58 *infra*), the rather seeing that these 'Egyptians' *ἔλαβον τὰς Δωριέων βασιληίας.* Hdt. does not say that the rights and duties enumerated are a residuum surviving from a time when the king was much more powerful; still less does he mean that these privileges have been but are not now given. The duplication of the kingship may have been accompanied, or followed, by not merely a *de facto* limitation and diminution of the royal power, but by an express contract, or Rhetra, on the subject. That the dual royalty was believed to have been of distinct institution seems implied in the passage quoted c. 52 *supra*, from Thucydides, 5. 16, and, indeed, in the story given by Hdt. of its origin just above. The contractual basis of the Spartan kingships was attested by the menstrual oath, Xenoph. *op. c.* xv. 7 *ὁ δὲ ὅρκος ἐστὶ τῷ μὲν βασιλεῖ κατὰ τοὺς τῆς πόλεως κειμένους νόμους βασιλεύειν, τῇ δὲ πόλει ἐμπεδορκοῦντος ἐκείνου ἀστυφέλικτον τὴν βασιλείαν παρέξειν.*

ἱρωσύνας δύο. Do these specially concern *τὰ ἐμπολέμια*, or concern them at all? Perhaps the *ἄγος* which is incurred by any one thwarting the kings on the war-trail may be connected with their hieratic functions. Xen. *op. c.* xiii. 2 represents the king as sacrificing to Zeus *ἀγήτωρ* and to Athene, when going forth to war.

How these two priesthoods were held, whether jointly or severally, and so forth, is unfortunately not stated. There was a special point no doubt in kings (*διογενεῖς· διοτρεφεῖς*) being invested with priesthood of Zeus, who remained a *βασιλεὺς* even in democratic times and places. (Cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 1. 2, 7, 1252^{b}.) The Spartan kings in particular were, as Herakleids, his descendants, and Zeus was their ancestor. The Herakleid kings of Macedon had a similar relation to the Bottiaean Zeus, and the Aeakid dynasty in Epiros to the Dodonaean (Preller, *Griech. Mythologie*, i.[3] 119). The relation of the Athamantidae to the Laphystian Zeus (7. 197), of the ancestors of Isagoras to the Karian Zeus (5. 66), and the remark of the Hellespontine to Xerxes (7. 56) may be compared. Add the satire on the 'Olympian' Perikles Aristoph. *Acharn.* 530 (which might partly insinuate a charge *regni appetendi*).

Zeus Lakedaimon Preller (*l.c.*) fancifully explains as the god-king from whom the Lakedaimonian and Spartan Basileia was deduced; *Zeus Uranios* as the king-god of the polity in the heavens. With the surname *Lakedai-*

δαίμονος καὶ Διὸς οὐρανίου, καὶ πόλεμον ἐκφέρειν ἐπ᾽ ἣν ἂν βούλωνται χώρην, τούτου δὲ μηδένα εἶναι Σπαρτιητέων διακωλυτήν, εἰ δὲ μὴ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἄγεϊ ἐνέχεσθαι. στρατευομένων δὲ

---

mon Stein compares Ζεὺς Ἀγαμέμνων, Ζ. Ἀμφιάραος, Ζ. Ἀμφικτύων, Ζ. Ἡρακλῆς, Ζ. Τροφώνιος. There is a degree of localisation in the Λακεδαίμων which makes it, perhaps, unique. Whether the combination is a kenosis of Ζεὺς or an apotheosis of Λακεδαίμων may be doubted. Is it possible that Ζεὺς Λακεδαίμων was something more than an enchorial, that he was even a chthonian deity? The cult of Ζεὺς Οὐράνιος is attested by the μεγάλα Οὐράνια of which celebration there is epigraphic evidence. See Preller, i.[3] p. 119 n., Wide, *Lakonische Kulte* (1893), p. 2. Wide (*op. cit.* p. 23) remarks that (1) the cult of Zeus in Sparta is important, in the rest of Lakonia unimportant, primitive and even 'chthonic'; (2) Zeus is πατρῷος of the Herakleids: and therefore Zeus was a chief god of the Dorians: a *non sequitur*, cp. Homer, *Il.* 16. 233 *et passim*.

Neither of these deities looks particularly Dorian; if either, then Ζεὺς Οὐράνιος. Was that the priesthood of the inferior house?

3. **καὶ πόλεμον . . ἐνέχεσθαι.** Hdt. asserts that the kings could make war when and where they pleased, and that it was sacrilege for any Spartiate (Ephors, Gerusia, Apella) to stay it. It is not quite plain whether we are to understand that both kings acting together had this power, or that each acting separately possessed it. In either case the statement is hardly credible. It is true that in 5. 49 ff. Hdt. tells a story implying that about 500 B.C. Kleomenes might of his own accord have made war on the great King in the heart of Asia; and in 5. 74 seems to imply that about 507 B.C. Kleomenes put in motion the whole Peloponnesian confederacy. But those stories cannot be taken as accurate representations, see notes *ad ll.* On the other hand in 5. 64 Kleomenes is appointed to command in the Attic war. It is not to the king that Philippides applies in 490 B.C., c. 106 *infra* (but consult note *ad l.*). The second Persian war is plainly not conducted on the royal initiative, still less the Peloponnesian wars afterwards. The appointment of commanders-in-chief other than the kings implies the diminution of the royal authority and initiative. In 431 B.C. the king has not even a veto on the declaration of war (Thuc. 1. 87). Yet there is probably some ground for the misstatement of Hdt. The fiction that the king or kings had full responsibility in all matters of warfare was probably a convenient survival, and coloured the stories though it may not have affected the action of the Spartans. The really sovran power of the king in the field (though even this had been invaded before Hdt.'s day, cp. 9. 76), which on a long campaign might really aggrandise the royal power considerably (cp. Thuc. 8. 5), coloured the representation of the king's power over the inception of the campaign. The *modus operandi* and similar points may have been in the main within the competence of the king on service, though considerable degrees of insubordination were on record (cp. 9. 53). In short, a fiction which may possibly have corresponded to the facts in the days when Sparta was waging almost annual wars with its next-door neighbours was perpetuated, for various reasons, into a time when the conditions and problems of Spartan warfare had become much larger and more complex, while the power of the kings had suffered diminution, directly and indirectly. It is hardly credible that the alliance with Kroisos was made by the king or kings of the day; or even that the interference of the Spartans against the Peloponnesian tyrants (cp. 5. 92) was undertaken on the royal initiative alone. Cp. Appendix VII. § 8.

5. **αὐτόν.** Bresler suspected a lacuna after αὐτόν, Stein supplies τε καὶ τὸ γένος ἐκείνου or similar words, execrations being generally thus extended. Van Herwerden prefers τε καὶ γένος τὸ κείνου or better still τε ἐναγέα εἶναι καὶ γένος τὸ κείνου. Probably exile would be one of the results of the curse.

στρατευομένων. If the previous sentence is an over-statement of the royal prerogatives, this sentence seems to do scant justice to the power of the

πρώτους ἰέναι τοὺς βασιλέας, ὑστάτους δὲ ἀπιέναι· ἑκατὸν δὲ ἄνδρας λογάδας ἐπὶ στρατιῆς φυλάσσειν αὐτούς· προβάτοισι δὲ χρᾶσθαι ἐν τῇσι ἐξοδίῃσι ὁκόσοισι ἂν ὦν ἐθέλωσι, τῶν δὲ θυομένων πάντων τὰ δέρματά τε καὶ τὰ νῶτα λαμβάνειν σφέας.

57 ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐμπολέμια, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τὰ εἰρηναῖα κατὰ τάδε σφι δέδοται. ἢν θυσίη τις δημοτελὴς ποιέηται, πρώτους ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ἵζειν τοὺς βασιλέας, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρῶτον ἄρχεσθαι διπλήσια νέμοντας ἑκατέρῳ τὰ πάντα ἢ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι δαιτυμόνεσι, καὶ σπονδαρχίας εἶναι τούτων καὶ τῶν τυθέντων τὰ δέρματα. νεομηνίας δὲ πάσας καὶ ἑβδόμας ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς δίδοσθαι ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἱρήιον τέλεον ἑκατέρῳ ἐς Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ μέδιμνον ἀλφίτων καὶ οἴνου τετάρτην Λακωνικήν, καὶ ἐν τοῖσι ἀγῶσι πᾶσι προεδρίας ἐξαιρέτους. καὶ προξείνους ἀποδεικνύναι τούτοισι προσκεῖσθαι τοὺς ἂν ἐθέλωσι τῶν ἀστῶν, καὶ Πυθίους αἱρέεσθαι δύο ἑκάτερον. οἱ δὲ Πύθιοί εἰσι θεοπρόποι ἐς Δελφούς,

---

king when actually in the field. Cp. Thuc. 5. 66, Xen. *Rep. Lac.* c. xiii. Hdt. still writes as though both kings went out to battle together, notwithstanding his own statement, 5. 75 *supra*. This observation convicts the whole essay of anachronism.

6. **ἑκατόν.** Three hundred is the usual number. Cp. 7. 205, Thuc. 5. 72.

7. **προβάτοισι.** The right to have an unlimited number of victims killed and to keep the skins and backs, may sometimes have been a temptation to excessive piety or procrastination (9. 61). But it might on occasion serve a strategic purpose (c. 76 *infra*). Cp. Xen. *op. c.* xiii. 2-4.

57. 2. **δημοτελής.** At a state-sacrifice the kings take the chief seats, are helped first and to double portions, begin the libations, and have the skins of the victims as perquisites. The double portions were not, Xenophon informs us, *ἵνα διπλάσια καταφάγοιεν ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦδε τιμῆσαι ἔχοιεν εἴ τινα βούλοιντο*, *op. c.* xv.

6. **νεομηνίας.** On the first and on the seventh days of every month each king was supplied, at the public expense, with a full-grown victim to offer to Apollo, beside a bushel of barley-meal and a quart of wine (Laconian measure). The Laconian measures were probably the same as the Aiginetan (cp. Hultsch, *Metrologie*², p. 500). The first and seventh of the month were sacred to Apollo. Cp. A. Mommsen, *Chronologie*, pp. 82 f., 90.

9. **προεδρίας.** Cp. the anecdote c. 67 *infra*.

11. **δύο.** Xenophon, *op. c.* xv. 5, describes the *Pythii* as tent-comrades (*συσκήνους*) of the kings. As Hdt. states the number of Πύθιοι appointed by each king, and explains their functions, while he neither limits the *πρόξεινοι* nor explains their functions, we are left to conclude that the Spartan Proxeni discharged the ordinary functions of Proxeni elsewhere but differed in the method of appointment; that their number was not fixed, and that the kings combined to appoint them. The treatment of 'strangers' (cp. 9. 11) might be naturally a concern of the 'war-lords' (3. 148, 5. 50). Cp. the jurisdiction of the *πολέμαρχος* at Athens and of the 'Praetor' at Rome. For instances of the Spartan *προξενία* abroad, cp. Thuc. 5. 43, 2; 6. 89, 2, Xen. *Hell.* 6. 3, 4: two cases in which the *προξενία* was hereditary, or quasi-hereditary, and dated from before the Persian war (cp. Meier, *de Proxenia* (1843), pp. 8 f.); two other cases, *C. I. G.* 1334 f. These representatives are not appointed by the kings apparently, and it is difficult to suppose that the kings had the actual appointment of the representatives of Athens, etc. in Sparta: they might, however, have had a formal *congé d'élire*. P. Monceaux, *Les Proxénies Grecques* (1886), pp. 9 ff.

σιτεόμενοι μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων τὰ δημόσια. μὴ ἐλθοῦσι δὲ τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ἀποπέμπεσθαί σφι ἐς τὰ οἰκία ἀλφίτων τε δύο χοίνικας ἑκατέρῳ καὶ οἴνου κοτύλην, παρεοῦσι δὲ διπλήσια πάντα δίδοσθαι· τὠυτὸ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς ἰδιωτέων κληθέντας ἐπὶ δεῖπνον τιμᾶσθαι. τὰς δὲ μαντηίας τὰς γινομένας τούτους φυλάσσειν, συνειδέναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Πυθίους. δικάζειν δὲ μούνους τοὺς βασιλέας τοσάδε μοῦνα, πατρούχου τε παρθένου πέρι, ἐς τὸν ἱκνέεται ἔχειν, ἢν μή περ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτὴν ἐγγυήσῃ, καὶ ὁδῶν δημοσιέων πέρι· καὶ ἤν τις θετὸν παῖδα ποιέεσθαι ἐθέλῃ, βασιλέων ἐναντίον ποιέεσθαι. καὶ παρίζειν βουλεύουσι τοῖσι γέρουσι ἐοῦσι δυῶν δέουσι τριήκοντα· ἢν δὲ μὴ ἔλθωσι, τοὺς μάλιστά σφι τῶν γερόντων προσήκοντας ἔχειν τὰ τῶν βασιλέων γέρεα, δύο ψήφους τιθεμένους, τρίτην δὲ τὴν ἑωυτῶν.

---

suggests (in the light of some late analogies) that the *Proxeni* nominated by the kings were extraordinary, to meet the cases of states who had no ordinary *Proxenos* in Sparta. Hdt. who visited Sparta (3. 55) ought to be a good authority on this point.

θεοπρόποι. The king, however, sometimes went to Delphi in person if the story c. 76 *infra* be true. Van Herwerden brackets ἐς Δελφοὺς "ob structurae duritiem."

12. **σιτεόμενοι μ. τ. β. τὰ δ.** Perhaps only applied to warfare. Cp. Xenoph. *op. c.* xv. 4, 5.

μὴ ἐλθοῦσι δέ. If this passage, μὴ ἐλθοῦσι . . δίδοσθαι (or, rather, down to τιμᾶσθαι), refers to the δεῖπνον after a θυσίη δημοτελής, it should be replaced above after the words τὰ δέρματα. Standing where it now does it must be taken to refer to the σίτησις of the kings, shared by the Pythii, which should apparently have been restricted to warfare. But the Pythii may have messed with the king at the φιδίτια.

Forty-eight χοίνικες went to the μέδιμνος, 144 κοτύλαι, or 12 χόες, to the μετρήτης. These are here Aiginetan or Laconian measures, presumably. In 425 B.C. at Sphakteria the blockaded Spartans were each allowed daily 2 χοίνικες of barley-meal and 2 κοτύλαι of wine, with half the quantities for their servants (Thuc. 4. 16). But those were Attic measures, and larger than Laconian. Cp. 'Αθην. πολ. c. 10 with Sandys' note, Ridgway, *Origin of Currency*, etc. p. 214.

14. **διπλήσια,** *sc.* ἢ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι δαιτυμόνεσι πάντα including flesh.

16. **τὰς δὲ μαντηίας.** The hieratic characters of the kings reappears (cp. 5. 90).

17. **μούνους . . μοῦνα.** In conjunction with the *Gerusia* the kings would share jurisdiction in other cases (cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 9, 25, 1270 b). This special jurisdiction apparently is connected with the Family (marriage of heiresses and adoptions). These questions might concern the kings, as heads of the highest families; as 'war-lords' they were interested in the 'cura viarum.' Stein (followed by Gilbert, i.² 50) understands the phrase merely of settling boundary disputes. At Athens the archon presided in family suits, 'Αθ. πολ. c. 56, which may have been detached from the jurisdiction of the Basileus. Van Herwerden for πατρούχου would read πατρωιούχου, after Roehl, on the strength of the Gortynian inscription, which can hardly prove that Hdt. used the word. (Perhaps Hdt. wrote παμούχου=παμώχου.) On the restriction ἢν μή περ ὁ πατὴρ κτλ. cp. Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 9, 15, 1270 a, and c. 130 *infra*.

21. **παρίζειν.** Certainly does not mean 'to preside.' The kings might be absent from the session. Whether they ever acted as chairmen, or might summon the *Gerusia*, does not appear.

24. **δύο.** Thucydides in a celebrated passage (1. 20, 3) gives as an instance of popular errors the belief that each of the kings of the Lakedaimonians had two votes, not one only. It has been

58 Ταῦτα μὲν ζῶσι τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι δέδοται ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Σπαρτιητέων, ἀποθανοῦσι δὲ τάδε. ἱππέες περιαγγέλουσι τὸ γεγονὸς κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Λακωνικήν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν πόλιν γυναῖκες περιιοῦσαι λέβητα κροτέουσι. ἐπεὰν ὦν τοῦτο γίνηται τοιοῦτο, ἀνάγκη ἐξ οἰκίης ἑκάστης ἐλευθέρους δύο καταμιαίνεσθαι, ἄνδρα τε καὶ γυναῖκα· μὴ ποιήσασι δὲ τοῦτο ζημίαι μεγάλαι ἐπικέαται. νόμος δὲ τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι κατὰ τῶν βασιλέων τοὺς θανάτους ἐστὶ ὡυτὸς καὶ τοῖσι βαρβάροισι τοῖσι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ· τῶν γὰρ ὦν βαρβάρων οἱ πλεῦνες τῷ αὐτῷ νόμῳ χρέωνται κατὰ τοὺς θανάτους τῶν βασιλέων. ἐπεὰν γὰρ ἀποθάνῃ βασιλεὺς Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐκ πάσης δεῖ Λακεδαίμονος, χωρὶς Σπαρτιητέων, ἀριθμῷ τῶν περιοίκων ἀναγκαστοὺς ἐς τὸ κῆδος ἰέναι. τούτων

---

debated whether Thuc. is consciously referring to this passage, and urged on behalf of Hdt. that he does not say that each king had two votes. This is true; he does not: neither does he say, as Thucydides, that each king had only one vote. In short, Hdt. expresses himself obscurely, probably because his ideas were obscure upon the subject. His language here is capable of being harmonised with either the erroneous view, which Thucydides says was common, or the correct view, which Thucydides substitutes. Whether Thucydides had this particular passage of Hdt.'s work in view, or only the popular and widespread error, from which Hdt. had not emancipated himself, and to which, by his ambiguous utterance here, he may have given further circulation, depends on the previous question whether Thucydides was acquainted with the work of Herodotus or not. If he was acquainted with the work of Hdt. he was probably referring to it, for it is significant that in the same passage (1. 20, 3) he corrects another supposed error which is certainly found in Hdt. 9. 53. (The 'previous question' must here be reserved, but the weight of argument and evidence is in favour of believing that Thucydides was acquainted with Hdt.'s work.)

τρίτην δὲ τὴν ἑωυτῶν. The question is whether Hdt. means that the Gerontes in question gave six votes in all, or four votes in all. 'Two for each king and then each his own': or 'two for the two kings and then thirdly (and fourthly) each his own.' The obscurity is perhaps due, at least in part, to Hdt.'s not contemplating separately the cases where one king was absent and where both kings were absent. Nor does he state whether the royal proxies gave the votes by direction of the kings, as the kings would have voted, if present, or whether they were free to vote according to their own judgment. Nor does he state clearly whether each king was represented *in absentia* by one or more than one relative.

58. 1. **ταῦτα . . τάδε.** Cp. c. 53 *supra*. **δέδοται ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Σπαρτιητέων.** Cp. c. 57 *supra*.

2. **ἱππέες.** Note that all Lakonia was *ἱππάσιμος* (?). These *ἱππέες* are presumably genuine mounted couriers, not the so-called *Hippeis*, or 300 chosen Hoplites (Gilbert, *St. Alt.* i. 77 = i.[2] 81).

4. **λέβητα κροτέουσι . . καταμιαίνεσθαι.** Such extravagant signs of mourning were not in accordance with Hellenic sentiment and practice, or at least with the higher Athenian culture (cp. Pericles' Fun. Or. Thuc. 2. 45). It was an archaic or a 'barbarous' excess. Solon was credited with having restricted it by statute at Athens (Plutarch, *Sol.* 12), and in Plutarch's own time and family a supreme self-control was to be observed in such matters, cp. Plut. *Consol. ad Uxorem* (*Mor.* 608 ff.). According to Plutarch even Lykurgos had limited these demonstrations at Sparta: *Instit. Lac.* 18 (*Mor.* 238), *Vit. Lyc.* 27. Cp. further: L. Schmidt, *Die Ethik der Alten Griechen*, ii. p. 114 f. and especially Bekker, *Charicles*, Excursus to the ninth scene.

ὧν καὶ τῶν εἱλωτέων καὶ αὐτῶν Σπαρτιητέων ἐπεὰν συλλεχθέωσι
ἐς τὠυτὸ πολλαὶ χιλιάδες σύμμιγα τῇσι γυναιξί, κόπτονταί τε
τὰ μέτωπα προθύμως καὶ οἰμωγῇ διαχρέωνται ἀπλέτῳ, φάμενοι
τὸν ὕστατον αἰεὶ ἀπογενόμενον τῶν βασιλέων, τοῦτον δὴ γενέ-
σθαι ἄριστον. ὃς δ' ἂν ἐν πολέμῳ τῶν βασιλέων ἀποθάνῃ,
τούτῳ δὲ εἴδωλον σκευάσαντες ἐν κλίνῃ εὖ ἐστρωμένῃ ἐκφέ-
ρουσι. ἐπεὰν δὲ θάψωσι, ἀγορὴ δέκα ἡμερέων οὐκ ἵσταταί σφι
οὐδ' ἀρχαιρεσίη συνίζει, ἀλλὰ πενθέουσι ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας.
Συμφέρονται δὲ ἄλλο οὗτοι τόδε τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι· ἐπεὰν 59
ἀποθανόντος τοῦ βασιλέος ἄλλος ἐνίστηται βασιλεύς, οὗτος ὁ
ἐσιὼν ἐλευθεροῖ ὅστις τι Σπαρτιητέων τῷ βασιλέϊ ἢ τῷ δημοσίῳ
ὤφειλε· ἐν δ' αὖ Πέρσῃσι ὁ κατιστάμενος βασιλεὺς τὸν προ-
οφειλόμενον φόρον μετιεῖ τῇσι πόλισι πάσῃσι. συμφέρονται 60
δὲ καὶ τάδε Αἰγυπτίοισι Λακεδαιμόνιοι· οἱ κήρυκες αὐτῶν καὶ
αὐληταὶ καὶ μάγειροι ἐκδέκονται τὰς πατρωίας τέχνας, καὶ

---

17. **πολέμῳ.** The death of a Spartan king in warfare was a rarity, and the failure to recover his body probably unique in the case of Leonidas. Plutarch, *Agis* 21, gives us to understand that the divinity which hedged a Spartan king was his security from the hands of the foeman: *διὸ καὶ πολλῶν γεγονότων Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀγώνων πρὸς Ἕλληνας εἷς μόνος ἀνῃρέθη πρὸ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν δόρατι πληγεὶς περὶ Λεῦκτρα Κλεόμβροτος.* Cp. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 4, 13 and Büchsenschütz's note. Agesipolis died on foreign service in Macedonia. His body was preserved 'in honey,' brought back to Sparta and *ἔτυχε τῆς βασιλικῆς ταφῆς*, Xen. *Hell.* 5. 3, 19. So previously Agis *ἔτυχε σεμνοτέρας ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταφῆς*, *ib.* 3. 3, 1. Xenoph. *Rep. Lac. ad fin.* gives the reason for these honours: *οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπους ἀλλ' ὡς ἥρωας τοὺς . . βασιλεῖς προτετιμήκασιν.*

19. **οὐκ ἵσταται κτλ.** The phraseology here is unsatisfactory. Stein explains *ἀγορὴ* as including everything that took place in the market-place, and *ἀρχαιρεσίη* as one particular case, viz. 'electoral meeting' (abstract for concrete). Krüger pointed out that *οὐ κατίσταται* would be preferable, cp. Thuc. 1. 31, 4; 3. 36, 6. Van Herwerden follows Krüger and in addition alters *ἀρχαιρεσίη* into *ἀρχαὶ οὐδὲ γερουσίη.* Verily, *ἀρχαιρεσίη συνίζει* is rather strong: moreover the Apella at Sparta probably did not sit.

59. 3. **Σπαρτιητέων.** This liberation of debtors does not apply to the Perioiki apparently, much less to Helots, or it would be a better parallel to the remission of arrears of tribute by the Great King. The pseudo-Smerdis improved on this rule, 3. 67. At Sparta the effect would apparently be to restore the *ὑπομείονες*, for the time at least, to the class of *ὁμοῖοι*, and so recruit the Spartiate caste at the expense of the Perioiki. Whether the king released those in debt to the public by paying their debts, or by simple proclamation, does not appear: presumably the latter. How private citizens could be in debt to the king is not clear. Plato, *Alkib.* i. 123, mentions a *βασιλικὸς φόρος, ὃν τέλουσιν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι.* This would presumably be a state-payment. Perhaps the private debts would be rent from the royal domains—in which case, however, we should expect it to be due, not from Spartiatae, but from Perioiki. It is conceivable that the Spartan kings were, unlike most other kings, money-lenders; but the *κλάρια* (*τὰ παρὰ τῶν χρεωστῶν γραμματεῖα*) mentioned by Plutarch (*Agis* 13) do not appear to have belonged to the king, and in any case would prove little for the time of Hdt.

60. 2. **οἱ κήρυκες.** The Talthybiadae. Cp. 7. 134.

3. **αὐληταί.** Cp. Thuc. 5. 70 and Arnold's note *ad l.*

μάγειροι. These *chefs* presumably attended to the *φιδίτια*, and would

αὐλητής τε αὐλητέω γίνεται καὶ μάγειρος μαγείρου καὶ κῆρυξ κήρυκος· οὐ κατὰ λαμπροφωνίην ἐπιτιθέμενοι ἄλλοι σφέας παρακληίουσι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἐπιτελέουσι.

61 Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω γίνεται. τότε δὲ τὸν Κλεομένεα ἐόντα ἐν τῇ Αἰγίνῃ καὶ κοινὰ τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀγαθὰ προεργαζόμενον ὁ Δημάρητος διέβαλε, οὐκ Αἰγινητέων οὕτω κηδόμενος ὡς φθόνῳ καὶ ἄγῃ χρεώμενος. Κλεομένης δὲ νοστήσας ἀπ' Αἰγίνης ἐβούλευε τὸν Δημάρητον παῦσαι τῆς βασιληίης, διὰ πρῆγμα τοιόνδε ἐπίβασιν ἐς αὐτὸν ποιεύμενος. Ἀρίστωνι βασιλεύοντι ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ γήμαντι γυναῖκας δύο παῖδες οὐκ ἐγίνοντο. καὶ οὐ γὰρ συνεγινώσκετο αὐτὸς τούτων εἶναι αἴτιος, γαμέει τρίτην γυναῖκα· ὧδε δὲ γαμέει. ἦν οἱ φίλος τῶν Σπαρτιητέων ἀνήρ,

---

be more important personages than ordinary domestics. Perhaps they accompanied the armies in the field, cp. 9. 82. Whether they were free or servile does not clearly appear from these passages: Helotry too was hereditary. The passage may read to us almost like a jest or a parody (as if one said: 'Kingship and cookery are hereditary arts'), but it is probably authentic and serious. In every society to a certain extent, in non-progressive societies and in societies obviously based on conquest and slave labour to a greater extent, crafts are and remain hereditary. The difference between Athens and Sparta, Sparta and Egypt, Egypt and India in these respects was one of degree not of kind. Some have asserted that there were 'castes' in early Greece (see Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, iii.^{3} 265, n. to 5. 66), others have denied that there were castes in Egypt (Wiedemann, *Herodots Zweites Buch*, p. 573). There has probably nowhere been a system of Castes to compare with the Indian, so fully sanctioned by religion, and so firmly established by secular custom; but ancient civilisations, based on war, slavery, blood, and religion, tended to stereotype classes, to give fixity to status, to limit contract, to eliminate individualism and competition. Of such societies in Greece Sparta was chief.

5. **κατὰ λαμπροφωνίην** only applies to the κήρυκες, and as a result in part of this inconsequence Hdt. involves himself in a grammatical obscurity, by an alternation of subjects. Cp. c. 57 *supra*. The obscurity is not abolished by bracketing the words as a gloss with van H.

61. 1. **τότε**, c. 50 *supra* = (summer) 491 B.C.

3. **διέβαλε.** *διέβαλλε*, c. 51 *supra*.

φθόνῳ. *φθόνος* is primarily human, Hellenic, and civil, 7. 237.

4. **ἄγῃ** is an emendation of Valckenaer, and justified by P. *ἄγαμαι* and *ἄγη* of bad feeling seems to be used especially of divinities (cp. L. & S. *sub vv.*).

6. **ποιεύμενος**, middle. Leotychides was his tool, c. 65 *infra*.

Ἀρίστωνι. Ariston, a contemporary of Anaxandrides and Kroisos, and presumably distinguished in the war with Tegea, 1. 67. Cp. c. 63 *infra ad fin.*

7. **δύο.** Only, however, one at a time (c. 63 *infra*), and in this respect his conduct differed from the conduct of his colleague Anaxandrides, 5. 40, and was less offensive to Spartan feeling.

9. **ὧδε.** The story which follows reads like a variation on the true and authentic history of Beauty and the Beast (Eros and Psyche). The facts are redistributed to some extent, but the situations and motives are similar: (1) the transfiguration is accomplished in the person of Beauty herself. (2) The *μηχανή* by which Beauty is won is practised upon the husband not upon the father, c. 62. (3) Ariston (Astrabakos) visits Beauty in disguise, c. 69 *infra*. (4) The hostile elements are represented by the Ephors (cc. 63, 65), Leotychides and Kleomenes: but by a finely dramatic touch Ariston's own words occasion the discomfiture of Beauty (c. 63). (5) Aphrodite is not the enemy but the friend of 'Beauty.' On the group of myths cp. Cox,

τῷ προσεκέετο τῶν ἀστῶν μάλιστα ὁ Ἀρίστων. τούτῳ τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐτύγχανε ἐοῦσα γυνὴ καλλίστη μακρῷ τῶν ἐν Σπάρτῃ γυναικῶν, καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι καλλίστη ἐξ αἰσχίστης γενομένη. ἐοῦσαν γάρ μιν τὸ εἶδος φλαύρην ἡ τροφὸς αὐτῆς, οἷα ἀνθρώπων τε ὀλβίων θυγατέρα καὶ δυσειδέα ἐοῦσαν, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ὁρῶσα τοὺς γονέας συμφορὴν τὸ εἶδος αὐτῆς ποιευμένους, ταῦτα ἕκαστα μαθοῦσα ἐπιφράζεται τοιάδε· ἐφόρεε αὐτὴν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέρην ἐς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης ἱρόν. τὸ δ' ἔστι ἐν τῇ Θεράπνῃ καλεομένῃ ὕπερθε τοῦ Φοιβηίου ἱροῦ. ὅκως δὲ ἐνείκειε ἡ τροφός, πρός τε τὤγαλμα ἵστα καὶ ἐλίσσετο τὴν θεὸν ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς δυσμορφίης τὸ παιδίον. καὶ δή κοτε ἀπιούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ ἱροῦ τῇ τροφῷ γυναῖκα λέγεται ἐπιφανῆναι, ἐπιφανεῖσαν δὲ ἐπειρέσθαι μιν ὅ τι φέρει ἐν τῇ ἀγκάλῃ, καὶ τὴν φράσαι ὡς παιδίον φορέει, τὴν δὲ κελεῦσαί οἱ δέξαι, τὴν δὲ οὐ φάναι· ἀπειρῆσθαι γάρ οἱ ἐκ τῶν γειναμένων μηδενὶ ἐπιδεικνύναι· τὴν δὲ πάντως ἑωυτῇ κελεύειν ἐπιδέξαι. ὁρῶσαν δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα περὶ πολλοῦ ποιευμένην ἰδέσθαι, οὕτω δὴ τὴν τροφὸν δέξαι τὸ παιδίον· τὴν δὲ καταψῶσαν τοῦ παιδίου τὴν κεφαλὴν εἶπαι ὡς καλλιστεύσει πασέων τῶν ἐν Σπάρτῃ

Mythology of the Aryan Nations, ed. 1882, pp. 209 ff. Cp. Roscher, *Lexicon*, *s.v.* Astrabakos. The above remarks and references are not intended to insinuate that the story of Ariston and his beautiful wife, the mother of Demaratos, is simply a myth or fable: the matter-of-fact element is probably the fundamental one in the story, but it has been fused and transfigured in a mythical atmosphere and is not sober history. That the transfiguration was the work of Hdt. is not likely: he gives the story as he heard it, though we need not suppose it to have lost in his telling. Possibly this story, or at least the latter part of it, the account of the birth of Demaratos, was put in evidence at the trial, cc. 65 f. *infra*. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxxvi f.

φίλος. His name is given below as Agetos son of Alkeides.

14. **ὀλβίων.** An indication of social inequalities among Spartans already.

17. **Ἑλένης.** Helen, then, was worshipped in Sparta, and as the goddess of Beauty. Cp. 2. 112, and *τὴν θεὸν* just below. Hdt. identifies her with Aphrodite Urania, *l. c.* This is probably a late theory; due perhaps to Homeric associations. The genuine Laconic Helena was, perhaps, more nearly akin to Artemis. Cp. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte*, pp. 340 ff. In a still older prae-Dorian (Arcadian) stage Helena was, perhaps, even a tree-spirit (Wide, *op. cit.* 343). Cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, i. 70 ff.

Θεράπνῃ. As Therapna was up a hill some two miles distant from Sparta on the left bank of the Eurotas, this daily pilgrimage showed considerable devotion. No doubt the hill was one of the strongholds of the prae-Dorian population. *Θεράπνη δὲ ὄνομα μὲν τῷ χωρίῳ γέγονεν ἀπὸ τῆς Λέλεγος θυγατρός, Μενελάου δέ ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῇ ναός, καὶ Μενέλαον καὶ Ἑλένην ἐνταῦθα ταφῆναι λέγουσι* (Pausan. 3. 19, 9). The hill was named the Menelaïon, and Curtius (*Pelopon.* ii. 239) compares its position in regard to Sparta with the position of Janiculum in regard to Rome. The Phoibeïon was on the right (west) bank of the river.

18. **ἱροῦ.** Krüger suspected, and van Herwerden removes.

21. **λέγεται.** Where would this λόγος or story of the Epiphany of the Madonna of Therapne more probably have been preserved than in the temple at Therapne itself? There Hdt. may possibly have heard it (3. 55). He does not quite believe it. Cp. 4. 184 *supra* and Introduction, p. ciii.

23. **οὐ φάναι,** to refuse.

γυναικῶν. ἀπὸ μὲν δὴ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρης μεταπεσεῖν τὸ εἶδος.
γαμέει δὲ δή μιν ἐς γάμου ὥρην ἀπικομένην Ἄγητος ὁ Ἀλκείδεω,
62 οὗτος δὴ ὁ τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος φίλος. τὸν δὲ Ἀρίστωνα ἔκνιζε ἄρα
τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ὁ ἔρως· μηχανᾶται δὴ τοιάδε· αὐτός τε τῷ
ἑταίρῳ, τοῦ ἦν ἡ γυνὴ αὕτη, ὑποδέκεται δωτίνην δώσειν τῶν
ἑωυτοῦ πάντων ἕν, τὸ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἕληται, καὶ τὸν ἑταῖρον
ἑωυτῷ ἐκέλευε ὡσαύτως τὴν ὁμοίην διδόναι· ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν φοβηθεὶς
ἀμφὶ τῇ γυναικί, ὁρέων ἐοῦσαν καὶ Ἀρίστωνι γυναῖκα, καταινέει
ταῦτα· ἐπὶ τούτοισι δὲ ὅρκους ἐπήλασαν. μετὰ δὲ αὐτός τε ὁ
Ἀρίστων ἔδωκε τοῦτο, ὅ τι δὴ ἦν, τὸ εἵλετο τῶν κειμηλίων τῶν
Ἀρίστωνος ὁ Ἄγητος, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν ὁμοίην ζητέων φέρεσθαι
παρ' ἐκείνου, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ τοῦ ἑταίρου τὴν γυναῖκα ἐπειρᾶτο
ἀπάγεσθαι. ὁ δὲ πλὴν τούτου μούνου τὰ ἄλλα ἔφη καταινέσαι·
ἀναγκαζόμενος μέντοι τῷ τε ὅρκῳ καὶ τῆς ἀπάτης τῇ παραγωγῇ
63 ἀπιεῖ ἀπάγεσθαι. οὕτω μὲν δὴ τὴν τρίτην ἐσηγάγετο γυναῖκα
ὁ Ἀρίστων, τὴν δευτέρην ἀποπεμψάμενος. ἐν δέ οἱ χρόνῳ
ἐλάσσονι καὶ οὐ πληρώσασα τοὺς δέκα μῆνας ἡ γυνὴ αὕτη τίκτει
τοῦτον δὴ τὸν Δημάρητον. καί τίς οἱ τῶν οἰκετέων ἐν θώκῳ
κατημένῳ μετὰ τῶν ἐφόρων ἐξαγγέλλει ὥς οἱ παῖς γέγονε. ὁ δὲ

---

28. **μεταπεσεῖν**, 'a change befell.'

62. 12. **ἀναγκαζόμενος.** The absolute inviolability of the oath in its literal meaning was a first principle of morality in its semi-conscious or prae-philosophic days. But this respect for the letter generated violations of the spirit in two directions: (1) evasions of obligation by a technical conformity and a virtual breach of contract in a good or a bad cause. Cp. the stories of Etearchos and Themison, 4. 154, and of the Persians and Barkaeans, 4. 201; (2) observance of the oath, spite of all consequences foreseen and unforeseen, as in the story of Ariston and Agetos in this passage. It was such situations as these, in which Themison and Agetos found themselves in presence of a conflict of duties or obligations, which stimulated casuistry; such casuistry the Hippolytos of Euripides, perplexed between his filial duty and the obligation of his oath of secrecy, formulates in the much misunderstood line (*Hippol.* 612) *ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ' ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος*, which earned for Euripides satire and censure, albeit Hippolytos in the play put away the temptation and concluded to abide by his oath: 657 f.

εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὅρκοις θεῶν ἄφαρκτος ᾑρέθην
οὐκ ἄν ποτ' ἔσχον μὴ οὐ τάδ' ἐξειπεῖν
πατρί.

In later times the philosophers showed themselves of the same mind as Hippolytos: Quod enim ita iuratum est ut mens conciperet fieri oportere id servandum est: quod aliter, id si non feceris, nullum periurium (Cicero, *de Off.* 3. 29, § 107). The difficulty arose, as L. Schmidt points out (*Ethik der Alt. Griechen*, 2. 8), partly from the failure of the pre-philosophic Greeks to distinguish between the obligation to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth on oath (*ἀληθορκεῖν· ψευδορκεῖν*), and the obligation to act in a certain way after a promise ratified by an oath (*εὐορκεῖν· ἐπιορκεῖν*). See further the story of Glaukos, c. 86 *infra*.

63. 3. **τίκτει.** The date of the birth of Demaratos might be about the year 541/2 B.C. See note c. 65 *infra*.

4. **οἰκετέων**, cp. c. 137 *infra*. The king had domestic slaves, cp. c. 68 *infra*.

ἐν θώκῳ κατημένῳ μετὰ τῶν ἐφόρων. Pausan. 3. 7, 7 telling this same anecdote says that Ariston was sitting with the Ephors *ἐν βουλῇ*. (It

ἐπιστάμενός τε τὸν χρόνον τῷ ἠγάγετο τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐπὶ
δακτύλων συμβαλλόμενος τοὺς μῆνας, εἶπε ἀπομόσας "οὐκ ἂν
ἐμὸς εἴη." τοῦτο ἤκουσαν μὲν οἱ ἔφοροι, πρῆγμα μέντοι οὐδὲν
ἐποιήσαντο τὸ παραυτίκα. ὁ δὲ παῖς ηὔξετο, καὶ τῷ Ἀρίστωνι
τὸ εἰρημένον μετέμελε· παῖδα γὰρ τὸν Δημάρητον ἐς τὰ μάλιστά
οἱ ἐνόμισε εἶναι. Δημάρητον δὲ αὐτῷ οὔνομα ἔθετο διὰ τόδε·
πρότερον τούτων πανδημεὶ Σπαρτιῆται Ἀρίστωνι, ὡς ἀνδρὶ
εὐδοκιμέοντι διὰ πάντων δὴ τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἐν Σπάρτῃ
γενομένων, ἀρὴν ἐποιήσαντο παῖδα γενέσθαι. διὰ τοῦτο μέν οἱ 64
τὸ οὔνομα Δημάρητος ἐτέθη· χρόνου δὲ προϊόντος Ἀρίστων μὲν
ἀπέθανε, Δημάρητος δὲ ἔσχε τὴν βασιληίην. ἔδεε δέ, ὡς ἔοικε,
ἀνάπυστα γενόμενα ταῦτα καταπαῦσαι Δημάρητον τῆς βασιληίης
διὰ τὰ . . Κλεομένεϊ διεβλήθη μεγάλως πρότερόν τε ὁ Δημάρη-
τος ἀπαγαγὼν τὴν στρατιὴν ἐξ Ἐλευσῖνος, καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε ἐπ'
Αἰγινητέων τοὺς μηδίσαντας διαβάντος Κλεομένεος.
Ὁρμηθεὶς ὦν ἀποτίνυσθαι ὁ Κλεομένης συντίθεται Λευτυχίδῃ 65
τῷ Μενάρεος τοῦ Ἅγιος, ἐόντι οἰκίης τῆς αὐτῆς Δημαρήτῳ, ἐπ'

---

may be doubted whether the King and Ephors alone constituted a meeting.) The Ephors hear the king's unfortunate remark, but although it is one of their special duties to maintain and guard the stock of Herakles in Sparta (cp. 5. 39), and although all Sparta has been praying that Ariston may have a son to succeed him (see just below), they take no notice of the remark at the time. *Credat Judaeus!*

6. **ἐπὶ δακτύλων.** Ariston, who appears, like a savage, to have had his arithmetic 'at his fingers' ends,' may perhaps have become confused, as persons are apt to be who have a difficulty in counting ten. This fingering is a touch of a kind much emphasised in some quarters as evidence of the truth and authenticity of a narrative. Cp. 4. 98 *supra*. It is undoubtedly both humorous and artistic, but is it history? Anyway, it is not calculated to raise our opinion of the king's education. The count was complicated by his having to allow for the difference between calendar and lunar months: or perhaps his doubt arose from his not (at first) making the allowance.

11. **τόδε.** The desire of the Spartans, that Ariston should have a son, did not arise from there being otherwise no legitimate successor, as the sequel proves that there was another branch of the lesser house in Sparta, which was thus more fortunately circumstanced than the elder house (5. 39 *supra*). An act of the Apella seems involved (πανδημεὶ Σπαρτιῆται . . ἀρὴν ἐποιήσαντο).

To what cause the extraordinary fame and popularity of Ariston were due does not clearly appear. The victory over Tegea belonged to the early years of his reign, and his reign seems to have lasted about half-a-century (Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* ii.[3] p. 258). Demaratos was king at the time of the expulsion of the Peisistratidae (5. 75 *supra*, and Pausanias, 3. 7, 7).

64. 1. **διὰ τοῦτο.** Rawlinson cps. "Louis le Désiré."

3. **ἔδεε**, cp. 5. 33 *supra* and Introduction, p. cxv.

5. **διὰ τὰ . .** The lacuna was first indicated by Stein. Might we not avoid it by reading διότι or διότι μὴ (cp. 1. 44) Κλεομένεϊ? Van Herwerden suggests διὰ τάδε· Κλεομένεϊ κτλ.

πρότερον, 5. 75 *supra*. About eighteen years before.

6. **τότε**, c. 51 *supra*.

To these two grounds of complaint of Kleomenes against Demaratos must almost certainly be added a third, arising out of the conduct of Demaratos in and after the Argive war (see c. 82 *infra*), which was much more recent.

65. 2. **Ἅγιος.** Hdt., or his authority,

ᾧ τε, ἢν αὐτὸν καταστήσῃ βασιλέα ἀντὶ Δημαρήτου, ἕψεταί οἱ ἐπ' Αἰγινήτας. ὁ δὲ Λευτυχίδης ἦν ἐχθρὸς τῷ Δημαρήτῳ μάλιστα γεγονὼς διὰ πρῆγμα τοιόνδε· ἁρμοσαμένου Λευτυχίδεω Πέρκαλον τὴν Χίλωνος τοῦ Δημαρμένου θυγατέρα, ὁ Δημάρητος ἐπιβουλεύσας ἀποστερέει Λευτυχίδεα τοῦ γάμου, φθάσας αὐτὸς τὴν Πέρκαλον ἁρπάσας καὶ σχὼν γυναῖκα. κατὰ τοῦτο μὲν τῷ Λευτυχίδῃ ἡ ἔχθρη ἡ ἐς τὸν Δημάρητον ἐγεγόνεε, τότε δὲ ἐκ τῆς Κλεομένεος προθυμίης ὁ Λευτυχίδης κατόμνυται Δημαρήτῳ, φὰς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἱκνεομένως βασιλεύειν Σπαρτιητέων οὐκ ἐόντα παῖδα Ἀρίστωνος· μετὰ δὲ τὴν κατωμοσίην ἐδίωκε, ἀνασώζων ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἔπος τὸ εἶπε Ἀρίστων τότε ὅτε οἱ ἐξήγγειλε ὁ οἰκέτης παῖδα γεγονέναι, ὁ δὲ συμβαλόμενος τοὺς μῆνας ἀπώμοσε φὰς οὐκ ἑωυτοῦ μιν εἶναι. τούτου δὴ ἐπιβατεύων τοῦ ῥήματος ὁ Λευτυχίδης ἀπέφαινε τὸν Δημάρητον οὔτε ἐξ Ἀρίστωνος γεγονότα οὔτε ἱκνευμένως βασιλεύοντα Σπάρτης, τοὺς ἐφόρους μάρτυρας παρεχόμενος κείνους οἳ τότε ἐτύγχανον πάρεδροί τε

66 ἐόντες καὶ ἀκούσαντες ταῦτα Ἀρίστωνος. τέλος δὲ ἐόντων περὶ

---

seems to have made a slip somewhere, as in 8. 131, where the complete genealogy of Leotychides is given, not an Agis but an Agesilaos appears as the father of Menares. It is characteristic of our author to leave such inconsistencies standing (cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.). Leotychides had to go back to Theopompos to find a sceptred ancestor, seven names separating the two. Only six names intervene between Theopompos and Demaratos. The reigns were longer than the generations. The same phenomenon recurs in the succession of Archidamos to Leotychides, a generation (Zeuxidamos) dropping out between. Cp. c. 71 *infra*.

5. **ἁρμοσαμένου**, middle. Cp. 5. 32 *supra*.

6. **Πέρκαλον**, *i.e.* Περίκαλον.

Χίλωνος. Chilon probably grandson of the sage (1. 59) and brother of Prinetades, father of Kleomenes' mother (5. 41) (Stein). So the wife of Demaratos was aunt of Kleomenes.

8. **ἁρπάσας**. The forms of marriage by capture survived at Sparta, and had a disciplinary purpose for the young warriors. Cp. Plutarch, *Lykurg. vit.* 15. Both the anthropological and the Spartan rationale of the institution are missed by K. O. Müller, *Dorians*, ii.[2] 278, and those who follow him. Leotychides seems to have converted the form into a reality on this occasion, peradventure not without the lady's goodwill. On the form of marriage, see M'Lennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, cc. ii.-iv.

9. **ἡ ἔχθρη ἡ ἐς τ. Δ.** It is, as a rule, the injurer rather than the injured that never forgives.

10. **κατόμνυται.** The *κατωμοσίη* apparently marks the first stage in the judicial proceedings (*δίωξις*); then follows the *ἀπόφασις* (*ἀπόφανσις*), with the *μαρτύρια*. How the court was constituted is not stated. Possibly by the Ephors, Gerusia, and the other king (Kleomenes in this case). Cp. Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.* i.[2] p. 62, note 2. The decision to refer the question to Delphi may have proceeded from the Apella (*ἔδοξε Σπαρτιήτῃσι* c. 66).

13. **τότε.** The proceedings against Demaratos fall into the year 491 B.C. (summer). He might be at least fifty years old at this time, as he was king in 511 B.C. Were the five ex-Ephors, who had been in office half-a-century before, produced as evidence of a remark of which they had made nothing at the time? And what would now be the ages of these Ephors? The youngest would have been at least eighty. No wonder Leotychides did not succeed in convincing the court (*ἀπέφαινε* imperfect).

αὐτῶν νεικέων, ἔδοξε Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἐπειρέσθαι τὸ χρηστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι εἰ Ἀρίστωνος εἴη παῖς ὁ Δημάρητος. ἀνοίστου δὲ γενομένου ἐκ προνοίης τῆς Κλεομένεος ἐς τὴν Πυθίην, ἐνθαῦτα προσποιέεται Κλεομένης Κόβωνα τὸν Ἀριστοφάντου, ἄνδρα ἐν Δελφοῖσι δυναστεύοντα μέγιστον, ὁ δὲ Κόβων Περίαλλαν τὴν πρόμαντιν ἀναπείθει τὰ Κλεομένης ἐβούλετο λέγεσθαι λέγειν. οὕτω δὴ ἡ Πυθίη ἐπειρωτώντων τῶν θεοπρόπων ἔκρινε μὴ Ἀρίστωνος εἶναι Δημάρητον παῖδα. ὑστέρῳ μέντοι χρόνῳ ἀνάπυστα ἐγένετο ταῦτα, καὶ Κόβων τε ἔφυγε ἐκ Δελφῶν καὶ Περίαλλα ἡ πρόμαντις ἐπαύσθη τῆς τιμῆς.

Κατὰ μὲν δὴ Δημαρήτου τὴν κατάπαυσιν τῆς βασιληίης 67
οὕτω ἐγένετο, ἔφυγε δὲ Δημάρητος ἐκ Σπάρτης ἐς Μήδους ἐκ τοιοῦδε ὀνείδεος. μετὰ τῆς βασιληίης τὴν κατάπαυσιν ὁ Δη-

---

66. 4. **προνοίης.** It was on the suggestion of Kleomenes that the question of fact was referred to Delphi. Cp. *προθυμίης* c. 65 *supra*.

5. **προσποιέεται.** The intrigue of Kleomenes, Kobon, and Perialla throws suggestive light upon the sources of oracular inspiration in some cases. It can hardly be assumed that every such case was discovered and exposed. The implication of the Prophetess implies that her utterance was articulate. Cp. 5. 92 *supra*.

6. **δυναστεύοντα.** Cp. *ἐδυνάστευε* c. 35 *supra*.

9. **ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ.** It is to be regretted that the date is not more specific. It may be inferred that the exposure did not ensue till after the flight of Demaratos from Sparta, otherwise it would be difficult to explain why he was not reinstated: albeit the discovery that the Pythia was corrupt would not *ipso facto* have proved that Demaratos was legitimate. The exile of Kobon, the deposition of Perialla presumably synchronised with the 'retirement' of Kleomenes, c. 74 *infra*. If that preceded Marathon, then *a fortiori* must the flight of Demaratos have taken place before that event. But cp. Appendix VII. § 5.

67. 3. **μετά.** How long after is not stated. If, as is probable, the Spartan civil year began in the autumn (cp. Thuc. 5. 36 for the year 421 B.C.), and if magistrates entered office at the beginning of the year, the insult to Demaratos could not be dated before the midsummer (July) 490 B.C. His deposition may have taken place in the summer of 491 B.C. and his election to an office, not specified, may have taken place before the beginning of the new year. Was he Ephor? and managing the Festival? (cp. Plutarch, *Agesilaos*, 29), or one of the five *Bidiaei*, whose function it was *τοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ Πλατανιστᾷ καλουμένῳ καὶ ἄλλους τῶν ἐφήβων ἀγῶνας τιθέναι*, Pausan. 3. 11, 2 (231). (On the forms *βίδεοι*, *βίδυοι* see Gilbert, *Handbuch*, i.[2] 28.) The *γυμνοπαιδίαι* were celebrated just after midsummer, cp. Thuc. 5. 82; Xen. *Hell.* 6. 4, 16. Leuktra was fought during the Festival (371 B.C.). Plutarch gives the day of the battle as the fifth of Hekatombaion (*Agesilaos*, 28), and the news was brought to Sparta during the Festival (*ib.* c. 29, Xen. *l. c.*).

Hesychius has: *Γυμνοπαιδία· ἔνιοι μὲν ἑορτὴν φασι Σπαρτιατικὴν ἐν ᾗ τοὺς ἐφήβους κύκλῳ περιθεῖν τὸν ἐν Ἀμυκλαίῳ βωμόν, τύπτοντας ἀλλήλων τὰ νῶτα. ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ ψευδῆ. ἐν ἀγορᾷ γὰρ ἑορτάζουσι· πληγαὶ δὲ οὐ γίνονται, ἀλλὰ πρόσοδοι χορῶν γεγυμνομένων.* Suidas has: *Γυμνοπαιδία, χοροὶ ἐκ παίδων ἐν Σπάρτῃ τῆς Λακωνικῆς εἰς θεοὺς ὕμνους ᾄδοντες, εἰς τιμὴν τῶν ἐν Θυραιαῖς ἀποθανόντων Σπαρτιατῶν.* The connexion with the *μουνομαχίη* in Thyreae (cp. 1. 82) is probably factitious. Xenophon and Plutarch, *ll. s. c.*, place the scene in the theatre, as Herodotus *infra*. Pausanias 3. 11, 7 has: *χορὸς δὲ οὗτος ὁ τόπος* (the Agora) *καλεῖται πᾶς ὅτι ἐν ταῖς γυμνοπαιδίαις, ἑορτὴ δὲ εἴ τις ἄλλη καὶ αἱ γυμνοπαιδίαι διὰ σπουδῆς Λακεδαιμονίοις εἰσίν, ἐν ταύταις οὖν οἱ ἔφηβοι*

μάρητος ἦρχε αἱρεθεὶς ἀρχήν. ἦσαν μὲν δὴ γυμνοπαιδίαι, θεωμένου δὲ τοῦ Δημαρήτου ὁ Λευτυχίδης γεγονὼς ἤδη βασιλεὺς αὐτὸς ἀντ' ἐκείνου, πέμψας τὸν θεράποντα ἐπὶ γέλωτί τε καὶ λάσθῃ εἰρώτα τὸν Δημάρητον ὁκοῖόν τι εἴη τὸ ἄρχειν μετὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν. ὁ δὲ ἀλγήσας τῷ ἐπειρωτήματι εἶπε φὰς αὐτὸς μὲν ἀμφοτέρων ἤδη πεπειρῆσθαι, κεῖνον δὲ οὔ, τὴν μέντοι ἐπειρώτησιν ταύτην ἄρξειν Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἢ μυρίης κακότητος ἢ μυρίης εὐδαιμονίης. ταῦτα δὲ εἴπας καὶ κατακαλυψάμενος ἤιε ἐκ τοῦ θεήτρου ἐς τὰ ἑωυτοῦ οἰκία, αὐτίκα δὲ παρασκευασάμενος

68 *ἔθυε τῷ Διὶ βοῦν, θύσας δὲ τὴν μητέρα ἐκάλεσε. ἀπικομένῃ δὲ τῇ μητρὶ ἐσθεὶς ἐς τὰς χεῖράς οἱ τῶν σπλάγχνων κατικέτευε, τοιάδε λέγων. "ὦ μῆτερ, θεῶν σε τῶν τε ἄλλων καταπτόμενος ἱκετεύω καὶ τοῦ ἑρκείου Διὸς τοῦδε φράσαι μοι τὴν ἀληθείην, τίς μευ ἐστὶ πατὴρ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ. Λευτυχίδης μὲν γὰρ ἔφη ἐν τοῖσι νείκεσι λέγων κυέουσάν σε ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρὸς οὕτω ἐλθεῖν παρὰ Ἀρίστωνα· οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸν ματαιότερον λόγον λέγοντες φασί σε ἐλθεῖν παρὰ τῶν οἰκετέων τὸν ὀνοφορβόν, καὶ ἐμὲ ἐκείνου εἶναι παῖδα. ἐγώ σε ὦν μετέρχομαι τῶν θεῶν εἰπεῖν τὠληθές· οὔτε γάρ, εἴ περ πεποίηκάς τι τῶν λεγομένων, μούνη δὴ πεποίηκας, μετὰ πολλέων δέ· ὅ τε λόγος πολλὸς ἐν Σπάρτῃ ὡς Ἀρί-*

χοροὺς ἱστᾶσι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. There were evidently gymnastic and musical exercises, and the transactions were not confined to one spot. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 4, 16 (*γυμνοπαιδιῶν τε οὔσης τῆς τελευταίας καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρικοῦ χοροῦ ἔνδον ὄντος*) does not, however, prove absolutely that the Theatre was used only on the last day. Cp. Appendix VII. § 5.

5. **ἤδη** does not leave much interval between the deposition of Demaratos and the occasion described.

7. **λάσθῃ**: *μή μ', ὦ μάταιε ναῦτα, τὴν ἄκραν κάμπτων | χλεύην τε ποιεῦ καὶ γέλωτα καὶ λάσθην*, Anthol. 7. 345. (Cp. J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik*, 133.)

10. **μυρίης.** Cp. *μυρίη ὄψις* 2. 136, *θῶμα μυρίον* 2. 148.

κακότητος. Cp. 8. 109. With the formula, cp. *ἀρχὴ κακῶν Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι* 5. 97 *supra*. It can hardly be said that the prophetic alternative of Demaratos was fulfilled.

12. **θεήτρου.** This building may have been on the same site as the marble theatre, located by Pausan. 3. 14 to the east of the Agora.

13. **τῷ Διί,** *sc. τῷ ἑρκείῳ*, god of the family and household. Demaratos had lost the priesthood of *Ζεὺς Λακεδαίμων* or of *Ζεὺς Οὐράνιος* (cp. c. 56 *supra*) but he could still sacrifice in person to *Ζεὺς ἑρκεῖος* in his own *αὐλή*. (Cp. Preller, *Gr. Mythologie*, i.³ 117.)

τὴν μητέρα ἐκάλεσε. His mother, though not young, is still alive: this scene is not necromantic.

68. 2. **ἐσθεὶς κτλ.** Making her thereby partaker in the sacrifice (*Eidopfer*, cp. Stengel, in I. Müller's *Handbuch*, v. 3, § 77), and accursed if she forsware herself. (Cp. Hermann, *Gr. Antiqq.* II.² ii. 22.)

3. **τοιάδε.** Hdt. does not always introduce his speeches with such a qualification. Cp. cc. 12 *supra*, 86 *infra*.

5. **ὀρθῷ λόγῳ,** c. 53 *supra*, 'in truth.'

τοῖσι νείκεσι. Cp. c. 66 *supra*.

7. **οἱ δὲ καί.** There were two stories about the birth of Demaratos, beside the view that he was the true son of Ariston. The *ματαιότερος λόγος* is a bit of rationalism, exercised upon the genuinely mythical touch contributed in the person of Astrobakos. Cp. note c. 61 *supra*.

στωνι σπέρμα παιδοποιὸν οὐκ ἐνῆν· τεκεῖν γὰρ ἄν οἱ καὶ τὰς
προτέρας γυναῖκας." ὁ μὲν δὴ τοιαῦτα ἔλεγε, ἡ δὲ ἀμείβετο 69
τοισίδε. "ὦ παῖ, ἐπείτε με λιτῇσι μετέρχεαι εἰπεῖν τὴν ἀληθείην, πᾶν ἐς σὲ κατειρήσεται τὠληθές. ὥς με ἠγάγετο Ἀρίστων ἐς ἑωυτοῦ, νυκτὶ τρίτῃ ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἦλθέ μοι φάσμα εἰδόμενον Ἀρίστωνι, συνευνηθὲν δὲ τοὺς στεφάνους τοὺς εἶχε ἐμοὶ περιετίθεε. καὶ τὸ μὲν οἰχώκεε, ἧκε δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀρίστων. ὡς δέ με εἶδε ἔχουσαν στεφάνους, εἰρώτα τίς εἴη μοι ὁ δούς· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφάμην ἐκεῖνον, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ὑπεδέκετο. ἐγὼ δὲ κατωμνύμην φαμένη αὐτὸν οὐ ποιέειν καλῶς ἀπαρνεόμενον· ὀλίγῳ γάρ τι πρότερον ἐλθόντα καὶ συνευνηθέντα δοῦναί μοι τοὺς στεφάνους. ὁρέων δέ με κατομνυμένην ὁ Ἀρίστων ἔμαθε ὡς θεῖον εἴη τὸ πρῆγμα. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν οἱ στέφανοι ἐφάνησαν ἐόντες ἐκ τοῦ ἡρωίου τοῦ παρὰ τῇσι θύρῃσι τῇσι αὐλείῃσι ἱδρυμένου, τὸ καλέουσι Ἀστροβάκου, τοῦτο δὲ οἱ μάντιες τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον ἥρωα ἀναίρεον εἶναι. οὕτω ὦ παῖ ἔχεις πᾶν, ὅσον τι καὶ βούλεαι πυθέσθαι· ἢ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἥρωος τούτου γέγονας, καί τοι πατήρ ἐστι Ἀστρόβακος ὁ ἥρως, ἢ Ἀρίστων· ἐν γάρ σε τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἀναιρέομαι. τῇ δέ σευ μάλιστα κατάπτονται οἱ ἐχθροί, λέγοντες ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀρίστων, ὅτε αὐτῷ σὺ ἠγγέλθης γεγενημένος, πολλῶν ἀκουόντων οὐ φήσειέ σε ἑωυτοῦ εἶναι (τὸν χρόνον γάρ, τοὺς δέκα μῆνας, οὐδέκω ἐξήκειν), ἀιδρείῃ τῶν τοιούτων κεῖνος τοῦτο ἀπέρριψε τὸ ἔπος. τίκτουσι γὰρ γυναῖκες καὶ ἐννεάμηνα καὶ ἑπτάμηνα, καὶ οὐ πᾶσαι δέκα μῆνας ἐκτελέσασαι· ἐγὼ δὲ σὲ ὦ

---

69. 4. **φάσμα**, 8. 84. Cp. *ἐπιφανεῖσα* 5. 92 η *supra*, *φανῆναι* cc. 106, 135 *infra*.

11. **ὁρέων δὲ κτλ.** Note the validity of the asseveration on oath. Cp. c. 86 β *infra*.

13. **παρὰ τῇσι.** Demaratos and his mother were standing by the altar of Zeus Herkeios, just inside the gates of the courtyard. The stables and storehouses were probably hard by, with the chapel of Astrobakos, the patron of the Muleteers. Pausanias 3. 16, 6 (249) tells us all we know on the subject. It is evident that at some time the Agidae found room for Astrobakos (or Astrabakos) among their ancestors, for the story goes that Astrabakos and Alopekos, brothers in the fourth generation from Agis, found the *ξόανον* of Artemis Orthia, which was worshipped at Lakedaimon by human sacrifices till Lykurgos substituted flogging for death. This was evidence to Pausanias that the *ξόανον* in Limnatis was the true *ξόανον* brought by Orestes and Iphigeneia from Taurike. Cp. 4. 103 *supra*. Astrabakos and Alopekos went out of their minds (*παρεφρόνησαν*) over the discovery. (Cp. 5. 85 *supra*.) The mythologists associate Alopekos with the fox, and Astrabakos with the sumpter-mule (*ἀστράβη*), associations which might suggest that these heroes were probably not models of purity. Wide (*Lakonische Kulte*, p. 279) follows Benseler in explaining the name as = "One riding on a mule-saddle," and emphasises the resemblance between Astrabakos and Dionysos.

22. **τίκτουσι.** Hippokrates, *de Septimestr.* 1. p. 447, ed. Küh. quoted by Rawlinson, iii. p. 453 is even wilder: *τίκτειν καὶ ἑπτάμηνα καὶ ὀκτάμηνα καὶ ἐννεάμηνα καὶ δεκάμηνα καὶ ἐνδεκάμηνα, καὶ τούτων τὰ ὀκτάμηνα οὐ περιγίνεσθαι.*

παῖ ἑπτάμηνον ἔτεκον. ἔγνω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀρίστων οὐ μετὰ πολλὸν χρόνον ὡς ἀνοίῃ τὸ ἔπος ἐκβάλοι τοῦτο. λόγους δὲ ἄλλους περὶ γενέσιος τῆς σεωυτοῦ μὴ δέκεο· τὰ γὰρ ἀληθέστατα πάντα ἀκήκοας. ἐκ δὲ ὀνοφορβῶν αὐτῷ τε Λευτυχίδῃ καὶ τοῖσι

70 ταῦτα λέγουσι τίκτοιεν αἱ γυναῖκες παῖδας." ἡ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἔλεγε, ὁ δὲ πυθόμενός τε τὰ ἐβούλετο καὶ ἐπόδια λαβὼν ἐπορεύετο ἐς Ἦλιν, τῷ λόγῳ φὰς ὡς ἐς Δελφοὺς χρησόμενος τῷ χρηστηρίῳ πορεύεται. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ὑποτοπηθέντες Δημάρητον δρησμῷ ἐπιχειρέειν ἐδίωκον. καί κως ἔφθη ἐς Ζάκυνθον διαβὰς ὁ Δημάρητος ἐκ τῆς Ἤλιδος· ἐπιδιαβάντες δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι αὐτοῦ τε ἅπτοντο καὶ τοὺς θεράποντας αὐτοῦ ἀπαιρέονται. μετὰ δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἐξεδίδοσαν αὐτὸν οἱ Ζακύνθιοι, ἐνθεῦτεν διαβαίνει ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον. ὁ δὲ ὑπεδέξατό τε αὐτὸν μεγαλωστὶ καὶ γῆν τε καὶ πόλιας ἔδωκε. οὕτω ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην Δημάρητος καὶ τοιαύτῃ χρησάμενος τύχῃ, ἄλλα τε Λακε-

---

70. 3. **ἐς Ἦλιν.** A remarkable indication of the route followed by a Spartan in going to Delphi. Had Herodotus himself ever traversed this road? Cp. Introduction, pp. xciv f.

4. **δρησμῷ.** Plutarch mentions a *νόμος παλαιὸς* invoked against Agis IV. which *οὐκ ἐᾷ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀλλοδαπῆς τεκνοῦσθαι, τὸν δὲ ἀπελθόντα τῆς Σπάρτης ἐπὶ μετοικισμῷ πρὸς ἑτέρους ἀποθνήσκειν κελεύει* (*Agis* c. 11). It cannot have been rigidly enforced, as the case of Dorieus proves. But, if Demaratos was not son of Ariston, he was no Herakleid. Cp. however c. 75 *infra*.

5. **Ζάκυνθον**, 4. 195 *supra*.

7. **μετὰ δέ.** The flight of Demaratos from Sparta seems to fall in the summer of 490 B.C. (or possibly in the year previous). The date of his arrival in Asia, of his reception by Dareios, is unfortunately obscure. From 7. 3 it might be argued that Demaratos presented himself in Susa after Marathon, and after the revolt of Egypt, but before the death of Dareios, say about 486 B.C. Ktesias seems to place his advent very shortly before the passage of the Hellespont (Gilmore, p. 155): if this indication were trustworthy it might be taken to refer simply to the moment (in 480 B.C.) when Demaratos may have come from Pergamos to join Xerxes at Abydos. But see next note.

10. **γῆν τε καὶ πόλιας**: *Πέργαμον μὲν ἑκοῦσαν προσέλαβε (ὁ Θίβρων) καὶ Τευθρανίαν καὶ Ἁλίσαρναν, ὧν Εὐρυσθένης τε καὶ Προκλῆς ἦρχον οἱ ἀπὸ Δημαράτου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου· ἐκείνῳ δ' αὕτη ἡ χώρα δῶρον ἐκ βασιλέως ἐδόθη ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα συστρατείας* (Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1, 6). If Xenophon is right, the gift was not from Dareios, but from Xerxes, which, indeed, seems probable. Cp. the rewards to Histiaios and others 5. 11 *supra* and the *beneficia* to Themistokles from Artaxerxes, Thuc. 1. 138. The Troad was an alternative to Lakonia, for if Xerxes had been victorious, presumably Demaratos would have returned to Sparta as 'Tyrant' of Lakedaimon, perhaps as Satrap of Peloponnese or of Hellas. Cp. the dream of Pausanias, 5. 32 *supra*. The Prokles above-mentioned took part in the expedition of Kyros the younger and is described by Xenophon, *Anab.* 2. 1, 3 *Προκλῆς ὁ Τευθρανίας ἄρχων, γεγονὼς ἀπὸ Δημαράτου τοῦ Λάκωνος*: and in 7. 8, 17 as *Προκλῆς ἐξ Ἁλισάρνης καὶ Τευθρανίας ὁ ἀπὸ Δημαράτου.* Pythias, the daughter of Aristotle, was married to a Prokles in this same family (the second of her three husbands) and had two sons by him, Prokles and Demaratos, who became pupils of Theophrastos (Sext. Emp. *πρ. μαθηματικοὺς* 258, Bekker, ed. 1842, p. 657). It is an obvious hypothesis that Hdt.'s anecdotes of Demaratos may in part be drawn from the family traditions at Pergamos.

δαιμονίοισι συχνὰ ἔργοισί τε καὶ γνώμῃσι ἀπολαμπρυνθείς, ἐν δὲ
δὴ καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα σφι ἀνελόμενος τεθρίππῳ προσέβαλε, μοῦνος
τοῦτο πάντων δὴ τῶν γενομένων βασιλέων ἐν Σπάρτῃ ποιήσας.
Λευτυχίδης δὲ ὁ Μενάρεος Δημαρήτου καταπαυσθέντος διε- 71
δέξατο τὴν βασιληίην, καί οἱ γίνεται παῖς Ζευξίδημος, τὸν δὴ
Κυνίσκον μετεξέτεροι Σπαρτιητέων ἐκάλεον. οὗτος ὁ Ζευξίδημος
οὐκ ἐβασίλευσε Σπάρτης· πρὸ Λευτυχίδεω γὰρ τελευτᾷ, λιπὼν
παῖδα Ἀρχίδημον. Λευτυχίδης δὲ στερηθεὶς Ζευξιδήμου γαμέει
δευτέρην γυναῖκα Εὐρυδάμην τὴν ἐοῦσαν Μενίου ἀδελφεὴν Διακ-
τορίδεω δὲ θυγατέρα, ἐκ τῆς οἱ ἔρσεν μὲν γίνεται οὐδέν, θυγάτηρ
δὲ Λαμπιτώ, τὴν Ἀρχίδημος ὁ Ζευξιδήμου γαμέει δόντος αὐτῷ
Λευτυχίδεω. οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ Λευτυχίδης κατεγήρα ἐν Σπάρτῃ, ἀλλὰ 72

---

12. **ἀπολαμπρυνθείς.** Hitherto he has appeared in Hdt.'s narrative in an unfavourable light, cp. cc. 51, 61 *supra*. But in exile he appears to serve his country better. Cp. 7. 239 *et al.*

Hdt. becomes obscure over the exploits of Demaratos. Does he mean to say that Demaratos was the only king of Sparta who ever won a chariot race at Olympia? Or does he mean to say that he was the only king who having won such a victory had it proclaimed in the name of the Lakedaimonians, not in his own? (Cp. c. 103 *infra*, and Thuc. 5. 50.) There seems no possibility of dating exactly the victory of Demaratos ("zwischen 510 u. 491," H. Förster, *Die Olympischen Sieger*, p. 11, or rather 508-492 B.C. = Ol. 68-72). The event may have been commemorated on an inscription. Cp. Introduction, pp. lviii ff. and lxxxii. The grammar of the passage is not strict, *ἄλλα τε ἀπολαμπρυνθεὶς καὶ προσέβαλε* is inconsequent, and the duplication of *τε καὶ* (*ἔργοισί τε καὶ γνώμῃσι*) is clumsy. *ἄλλα τε ἀπολ. . . καὶ τοῦτο . . ποιήσας, Ὀλυμπιάδα . . προσέβαλε* would be more correct. The grammatical inconsequence is, however, Herodotean, cp. c. 74 *infra* *προσάγων καὶ ἦν*. So 1. 85 *ἐπιφραζόμενος καὶ ἐπεπόμφεε*, 3. 74 *αὐτοὶ μὲν φάμενοι . . κεῖνον δ' ἐκέλευον*.

71. 3. **Κυνίσκον.** The daughter of Archidamos was named Kyniska; she was the first woman that reared horses, and won a prize at Olympia (Pausan. 3. 15, 1).

5. **Ἀρχίδημον.** Archidamos succeeded his grandfather and father-in-law, though his own father never held the sceptre: what of the supposed law, put into the mouth of Demaratos, 7. 3? That law, if it existed at all, would only apply to cases where there was a number of sons of a reigning king.

6. **Μενίου.** Nothing is recorded of Menias and Diaktorides, brother and father of Eurydame, though they are mentioned here apparently as well-known persons. Hdt. presumably is drawing on his Spartan sources. The aunt was younger, as appears, than the nephew. On close marriages at Sparta, cp. 7. 239.

From the passage it may be inferred that Archidamos was still alive when Hdt. wrote it. Leotychides died in 469 B.C., see next c. Archidamos died in 428 B.C. (Thuc. 3. 1, 89). It is quite obvious that Zeuxidamos must have been born before Leotychides became king in 491/0 B.C., for Archidamos who succeeded in 469 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 134) was probably born about 499 B.C. Leotychides who may have been born about 550 B.C., and was perhaps sixty years of age when he succeeded Demaratos in 490 B.C., had a long life, and might well survive his son.

8. **δόντος.** It was not a runaway match as Demaratos' marriage had been c. 65 *supra*, but as it is hardly possible to suppose that the wedding of Archidamos and Lampito took place before 469 B.C., much less before 475 B.C., the act here referred to must have been a Betrothal, not an Espousal: the formula rather suggests the latter, cp. c. 130 *infra*.

72. 1. **οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ κτλ.**, 'Leotychides reached old age, but not in Sparta.'

τίσιν τοιήνδε τινὰ Δημαρήτῳ ἐξέτισε. ἐστρατήγησε Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἐς Θεσσαλίην, παρεὸν δέ οἱ πάντα ὑποχείρια ποιήσασθαι ἐδωροδόκησε ἀργύριον πολλόν· ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ δὲ ἁλοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ, ἐπικατήμενος χειρίδι πλέῃ ἀργυρίου, ἔφυγε ἐκ Σπάρτης ὑπὸ δικαστήριον ὑπαχθείς, καὶ τὰ οἰκία οἱ κατεσκάφη· ἔφυγε δὲ ἐς Τεγέην καὶ ἐτελεύτησε ἐν ταύτῃ.

73 *Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἐγένετο χρόνῳ ὕστερον· τότε δὲ ὡς τῷ Κλεομένεϊ ὡδώθη τὸ ἐς τὸν Δημάρητον πρῆγμα, αὐτίκα παραλαβὼν*

---

2. **τίσιν.** Cp. c. 84 *infra, ad fin.*

ἐστρατήγησε κτλ. Rawlinson, iii.[3] p. 455, dates this expedition 478 B.C. (*i.e.* in the same year as the expedition of Pausanias to Kypros, Thuc. 1. 94). Duncker, viii. 62, dates it two years later 476 B.C., the year (= 477/6 B.C.) that witnessed the separate organisation of the maritime Allies, and the victory of Eion (7. 107, Thuc. 1. 98), and connects it with the efforts made by Sparta to retain or recover her prestige and position by working in the area of the Amphiktyonic League against the 'Medizers' (cp. 7. 213). The return of Leotychides, his trial and exile, Duncker dates spring 475 B.C. Busolt, *Gr. G.* ii. 353, agrees with Duncker's date. (In Ἀθ. πολ. c. 23 the formation of the League is dated to the year of Timosthenes, 478/7 B.C., perhaps a slight prochronism.)

6. **ὑπὸ δικαστήριον ὑπαχθείς.** Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxvi. Doubtless Hdt. had heard in Sparta the more or less official account of the judicial condemnation of Leotychides; but was the story the truth, or the whole truth? It may fairly be doubted, both in the light of the story itself, and in the light of other similar stories, perhaps not less but more improbable. So much of Spartan history, especially of Sparta's internal history, is made up of the dishonour of her kings! Duncker has pointed out more fully and clearly than any one else the suspicions attaching to the stories of the end of Kleomenes, Leotychides, Pausanias, the great and ambitious kings of the fifth century, who aimed perhaps at ruling instead of merely reigning. A powerful king was more dangerous to the Dorian oligarchy than a weak king, and success in foreign warfare was best calculated to enhance a king's power. If Leotychides had really 'conquered Thessaly' he might have been more formidable to Sparta than as victor of Mykale, especially with the other king a minor, and his guardian abroad. Leotychides was already (in 476 B.C.) a greybeard: but ambition and masterfulness no more than avarice decrease with years. The charge of corruption may have been justified, but Leotychides may still have been sacrificed as a dangerous politician. Hdt. does not go behind what he has been told: still less does he suspect any foul play in the death of Leotychides. It probably coincided with the confederation of Arkadia against Sparta, cp. 9. 35, and it was surely no accident that Tegea was the refuge of the Spartan exile (cp. c. 74 *infra*). The Persian war strained the constitution of Sparta almost to bursting and collapse. Success and failure were alike fatal. Foreign commands were dangerous, not so much to the integrity of the individual Spartan, as to the conditions of the oligarchic régime at home. Leotychides and Pausanias, the victor of Mykale, the victor of Plataea, were too great for an oligarchic state: they went the way of Kleomenes. Spartan traditions never betrayed the Spartan government; a king is always at hand as a scape-goat (cp. 5. 49-51). If Leotychides really succumbed to a bribe, Themistokles and Athenian interests may have had something to say thereto. Duncker assigns the proposal of Themistokles to destroy the Peloponnesian fleet at Pagasae to the winter 476/5 B.C. vol. viii. pp. 65 ff. Busolt, ii. 354 n., virtually endorses his combination. (One might be tempted to put it in 479 B.C., as the Peloponnesians came back from the Hellespont, cp. Thuc. 1. 89-93.)

73. 1. **τότε δὲ** carries back to the accession of Leotychides in 491 B.C., c. 66 *supra*. **αὐτίκα** places the seizure of the Aiginetan hostages and their in-

Λευτυχίδεα ἤιε ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰγινήτας, δεινόν τινά σφι ἔγκοτον διὰ τὸν προπηλακισμὸν ἔχων. οὕτω δὴ οὔτε οἱ Αἰγινῆται, ἀμφοτέρων τῶν βασιλέων ἡκόντων ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, ἐδικαίευν ἔτι ἀντιβαίνειν, ἐκεῖνοί τε ἐπιλεξάμενοι ἄνδρας δέκα Αἰγινητέων τοὺς πλείστου ἀξίους καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ γένεϊ ἦγον καὶ ἄλλους καὶ δὴ καὶ Κριόν τε τὸν Πολυκρίτου καὶ Κάσαμβον τὸν Ἀριστοκράτεος, οἵ περ εἶχον μέγιστον κράτος· ἀγαγόντες δέ σφεας ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικὴν παραθήκην παρατίθενται ἐς τοὺς ἐχθίστους Αἰγινήτῃσι Ἀθηναίους.

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Κλεομένεα ἐπάιστον γενόμενον κακοτεχνή- 74
σαντα ἐς Δημάρητον δεῖμα ἔλαβε Σπαρτιητέων, καὶ ὑπεξέσχε ἐς Θεσσαλίην. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὴν Ἀρκαδίην νεώτερα ἔπρησσε πρήγματα, συνιστὰς τοὺς Ἀρκάδας ἐπὶ τῇ Σπάρτῃ, ἄλλους τε ὅρκους προσάγων σφι ἦ μὲν ἕψεσθαί σφεας αὐτῷ τῇ

---

ternment at Athens before the winter of 491/0 B.C.

4. **ἀμφοτέρων.** Notwithstanding the νόμος 5. 75 *supra*. Cp. c. 86 *infra*. It would be an evasion to say that the kings were not come ἐξιούσης στρατιῆς. The Aiginetans at least regarded it as a hostile demonstration (ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς) and yielded to a *force majeure*. That the kings of Sparta should be sent by the government to hand over ten of the principal men of the Dorian oligarchy to Athens, a democracy, seems to show that the Spartans were by this time fully alive to the danger of a Persian invasion, the restoration of 'tyrannies' under Persian auspices, perhaps the establishment of the tyranny in Sparta itself, the revival of Argos, the reappearance of the Phoenician in Thera and Kythera. Had not Sparta, if the story in 7. 133 be true, already thrown the Persian heralds into the Kaiadas? The action of Korinth at this juncture is not recorded at Sparta, nor at Athens: but it is safe to conjecture that Korinth at this crisis was with them, cp. c. 89 *infra*.

8. **Κριόν**, c. 50 *supra*.

Κάσαμβον. Nothing is ascertainable about this man, remarkable as is his name.

10. **παραθήκην.** The word is not used haphazard, but smooths the way for the wondrous argument put into the mouth of Leotychides, c. 86 *infra*. How long these hostages remained in Athens, how they were treated, who had them in charge, what finally became of them; on these vital questions Hdt. apparently felt no curiosity. Cp. c. 87 *infra* and Appendix VIII. § 5.

74. 1. **μετά.** How long after? Before or after the battle of Marathon? If the exile of Demaratos fell into the year 490 B.C. July (cp. c. 69 *supra*) and occasioned the exposure of Kleomenes, his flight to Thessaly may have taken place before Marathon, and these domestic troubles may help to account for the inaction and inconsequence of the Spartans in September 490 B.C., cp. c. 106 *infra*. The intrigue of Kleomenes in Arkadia, his restoration, insanity, and supposed suicide would follow, but surely not before the battle of Marathon. The way to Persia was barred to the conqueror of Argos by the start Demaratos had gained on him, and perchance by his part in the reception of the heralds of Dareios. What Demaratos (as Pausanias afterwards) hoped to effect from Susa, Kleomenes may have hoped to effect from Nonakris. The visit to Thessaly might have been connected with an idea of reviving the Amphiktyony against Sparta: but Kleomenes was discredited at Delphi. The old Arkadian League offered him the weapon, and Leotychides afterwards attempted to employ it again, c. 72 *supra*.

5. **ὅρκους.** On the force of oaths, cp. c. 62 *supra*. And on Styx as an ὅρκος, Homer, *Od.* 5. 185.

προσάγων . . καὶ . . ἦν. Cp. c. 70 *supra*.

ἂν ἐξηγέηται, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Νώνακριν πόλιν πρόθυμος ἦν τῶν Ἀρκάδων τοὺς προεστεῶτας ἀγινέων ἐξορκοῦν τὸ Στυγὸς ὕδωρ. ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ πόλι λέγεται εἶναι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀρκάδων τὸ Στυγὸς ὕδωρ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἔστι τοιόνδε τι· ὕδωρ ὀλίγον φαινόμενον ἐκ πέτρης στάζει ἐς ἄγκος, τὸ δὲ ἄγκος αἱμασιῆς τις περιθέει κύκλος. ἡ δὲ Νώνακρις, ἐν τῇ ἡ πηγὴ αὕτη τυγχάνει ἐοῦσα,
75 πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀρκαδίης πρὸς Φενεῷ. μαθόντες δὲ Κλεομένεα Λακεδαιμόνιοι ταῦτα πρήσσοντα, κατῆγον αὐτὸν δείσαντες ἐπὶ τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι ἐς Σπάρτην τοῖσι καὶ πρότερον ἦρχε. κατελθόντα δὲ αὐτὸν αὐτίκα ὑπέλαβε μανίη νοῦσος, ἐόντα καὶ πρότερον ὑπομαργότερον· ὅκως γάρ τεῳ ἐντύχοι Σπαρτιητέων, ἐνέχραυε ἐς τὸ πρόσωπον τὸ σκῆπτρον. ποιέοντα δὲ αὐτὸν ταῦτα καὶ παραφρονήσαντα ἔδησαν οἱ προσήκοντες ἐν ξύλῳ· ὁ δὲ δεθεὶς τὸν φύλακον μουνωθέντα ἰδὼν τῶν ἄλλων αἰτέει μάχαιραν· οὐ βουλομένου δὲ τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ φυλάκου διδόναι ἀπείλεε τά μιν αὖτις ποιήσει, ἐς ὃ δείσας τὰς ἀπειλὰς ὁ φύλακος (ἦν γὰρ τῶν τις εἱλωτέων) διδοῖ οἱ μάχαιραν. Κλεομένης δὲ παραλαβὼν τὸν σίδηρον ἄρχετο ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἑωυτὸν λωβώμενος· ἐπιτάμνων γὰρ κατὰ μῆκος τὰς σάρκας προέβαινε ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἐς τοὺς μηρούς, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μηρῶν ἔς τε τὰ ἰσχία καὶ τὰς λαπάρας, ἐς ὃ ἐς τὴν γαστέρα ἀπίκετο, καὶ ταύτην καταχορδεύων ἀπέθανε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ, ὡς μὲν οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσι Ἑλλήνων, ὅτι τὴν Πυθίην

---

6. **Νώνακριν.** Far to the north of Arkadia in the district of Azania (cp. c. 127 *infra*), the home of Arkadian independence. There at the tomb of Aipytos, first king of the land, was perhaps the focus for a confederation (cp. *Iliad* 2. 603-614), which Kleomenes now sought to revive in an anti-Dorian and anti-Spartan interest. Cp. E. Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, i. p. 163, and *History of Greece*, E. T. ii. p. 205.

9. **καὶ δὴ καὶ ἔστι τοιόνδε τι.** Hdt. writes almost as if he had been in Nonakris, though the critical λέγεται (cp. 4. 184) may infect the whole sentence, and he by no means describes the waterfall of the Styx in adequate terms. Cp. the autopsy of Pausanias, 8. 17, 5, 18. 2, and for modern references, Rawlinson, note *ad l.* Add Wordsworth's *Greece*, ed. Tozer, p. 384; Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, i. 195; Bursian, *Geogr. v. Griechenland*, ii. 202. Van Herwerden reforms the text by omitting πόλιν and τὸ Στυγὸς ὕδωρ first time, and inserting τε after λέγεται.

75. 2. **ἐπὶ τοῖσι κτλ.** The words support the view that the royal institution at Sparta was based on a contract. Cp. c. 52 *supra*.

4. **αὐτίκα.** He did not long survive his return.

5. **ὑπομαργότερον.** In 5. 42 *supra* he has been described as οὐ φρενήρης ἀκρομανής τε even before his accession.

6. **τὸ σκῆπτρον.** His badge of office. Cp. *Iliad* 2. 100-108.

7. **προσήκοντες.** Cp. c. 57 *supra* (τοὺς μάλιστά σφι . . προσήκοντας). But is it credible that relatives could attach the king's person, without intervention of Ephors or Gerusia?

τὸν φύλακον. This single helot, left to guard the mad king in the stocks, must have reported the conversation, but not till all was over with Kleomenes. With some of the details, cp. the story of Hegesistratos 9. 37. (On the form φύλακος cp. L. & S.)

15. **ἀπέθανε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ.** There was apparently no doubt anywhere entertained that Kleomenes died by his

ἀνέγνωσε τὰ περὶ Δημαρήτου λέγειν [γενόμενα], ὡς δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι μοῦνοι λέγουσι, διότι ἐς Ἐλευσῖνα ἐσβαλὼν ἔκειρε τὸ τέμενος τῶν θεῶν, ὡς δὲ Ἀργεῖοι, ὅτι ἐξ ἱροῦ αὐτῶν τοῦ Ἄργου Ἀργείων τοὺς καταφυγόντας ἐκ τῆς μάχης καταγινέων κατέκοπτε καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄλσος ἐν ἀλογίῃ ἔχων ἐνέπρησε.

Κλεομένεϊ γὰρ μαντευομένῳ ἐν Δελφοῖσι ἐχρήσθη Ἄργος 76
αἱρήσειν· ἐπείτε δὲ Σπαρτιήτας ἄγων ἀπίκετο ἐπὶ ποταμὸν

---

own hand under the most horrible circumstances. Every one accepted the Spartan account of the facts, which was necessarily an official account, and the only one available. But it was generally felt that some signal explanation was necessary of the king's fate. There are on record five rival hypotheses in explanation of the king's end: the pan-Hellenic (Delphian), the Athenian, the Argive, the Spartan, the author's own. Some of the conjectures betrayed local prejudices (as the Athenian, the Argive), though the majority of the Hellenes agreed that the unpardonable sin of Kleomenes was his corruption of the pan-Hellenic centre of inspiration. Hdt., however, prefers a more exact and personal illustration of the *lex talionis*. Cp. c. 84 *infra*. Oddly enough, the Spartans took a purely natural view of cause and effect in this instance, c. 84 *infra*. Hdt. has left it to Pausanias 3. 4, 6 to point out that the five hypotheses are all reconcilable; though the modern will be tempted to add that this harmony is far from proving the truth of any.

17. **τὰ περὶ Δ.** It is not actually asserted that what was said was false: even the truth may be told corruptly. It is obvious, however, that the posterity of Demaratos considered themselves genuine Herakleids. Cp. c. 70 *supra*.

γενόμενα *om.* Gomperz.

18. **ἐς Ἐλευσῖνα**, 5. 74 *supra*. The circumstance of the sacrilege is not mentioned in that place. The Athenians had another ἀσέβημα to report of Kleomenes (5. 72 *supra*).

τῶν θεῶν. Demeter and the Kora.

19. **ὡς δὲ Ἀργεῖοι.** The Argives may have assigned this cause for the doom of Kleomenes, but the story of the outrage which follows is not derived from Argive sources, and it is fair to remark that the assignment of these reasons to the Argives, the Athenians and "the majority of Hellenes," might be a fair result of inference on Hdt.'s part to the probabilities, or proprieties, of the case. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxviii f.

76. 2. **ἐπείτε.** The war between Sparta and Argos here narrated is unfortunately not dated by Hdt., who treats it merely as an episode in the biography of Kleomenes. Pausanias 3. 4, 1 places it immediately after the accession of Kleomenes (and Manso, *Sparta*, I. i. 303, ii. 329, actually dated it to 519 B.C. So too even Curtius, *Gr. G.* iii.[6] p. 889 and reff.).

It has been placed by others later, but still before the close of the sixth century; about 510 B.C. (Smith, *Dict. Biogr. s. v.* CLEOMENES) or 506 B.C., *i.e.* between the retreat from Eleusis and the application of Aristagoras in Sparta.

The formal and material arguments against the earlier and in favour of a later date, are numerous and strong: (1) The oracle associates the Argive war with the Ionian revolt and the capture of Miletos. This is a *prima facie* proof that the events were nearly synchronous, quite independent of the question whether the double-barrelled Pythian shot was a genuine prophecy. It is enough that before Hdt.'s time the capture of Miletos in 494 B.C. and the Argive war of Kleomenes were associated together at Delphi. Cp. c. 19 *supra*. (2) *C.* 500 B.C. Aristagoras urges the Spartan king μάχας ἀναβάλλεσθαι πρός τε Μεσσηνίους ἐόντας ἰσοπαλέας καὶ Ἀρκάδας τε καὶ Ἀργείους 5. 49 *supra*, which would have been rather beside the mark if the king had just put Argos *hors de combat* by a crushing defeat. (3) An impending war with Argos explains much better than a recent victory the refusal of the Spartans in 499 B.C. to assist the Ionians. Cp. the exactly parallel case half-a-century earlier, 1. 81 ff. 152. (4) The hypothesis that the defeat of Argos fell out about the same date as the capture of Miletos, 494 B.C., rather than ten or twenty years earlier, fits in

Ἐρασῖνον, ὃς λέγεται ῥέειν ἐκ τῆς Στυμφαλίδος λίμνης· τὴν γὰρ
δὴ λίμνην ταύτην ἐς χάσμα ἀφανὲς ἐκδιδοῦσαν ἀναφαίνεσθαι ἐν
Ἄργεϊ, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ ἤδη τοῦτο ὑπ' Ἀργείων Ἐρασῖνον
καλέεσθαι· ἀπικόμενος δ' ὦν ὁ Κλεομένης ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν
τοῦτον ἐσφαγιάζετο αὐτῷ· καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἐκαλλιέρεε οὐδαμῶς
διαβαίνειν μιν, ἄγασθαι μὲν ἔφη τοῦ Ἐρασίνου οὐ προδιδόντος
τοὺς πολιήτας, Ἀργείους μέντοι οὐδ' ὣς χαιρήσειν. μετὰ δὲ
ταῦτα ἐξαναχωρήσας τὴν στρατιὴν κατήγαγε ἐς Θυρέην, σφαγια-
σάμενος δὲ τῇ θαλάσσῃ ταῦρον πλοίοισί σφεας ἤγαγε ἔς τε τὴν
77 Τιρυνθίην χώρην καὶ Ναυπλίην. Ἀργεῖοι δὲ ἐβοήθεον πυνθα-
νόμενοι ταῦτα ἐπὶ θάλασσαν· ὡς δὲ ἀγχοῦ μὲν ἐγίνοντο τῆς

---

much better with what is recorded of the words and deeds of the Argives in 481 B.C. (7. 148, 149), where they excuse their neutrality on the ground of their recent loss in the war with Kleomenes. (5) Sikyon and Aigina appear as allies of Sparta. Aigina joined 516 B.C., Sikyon in 506 B.C. (Duncker, *l. c. infra* as against Pausanias). Cp. Grote, iv. p. 10 n.; Duncker, vii.[5] p. 72; Busolt, ii. 48. Cp. Clinton, ii.[3] 517 *note* x, who does not date the war "about 510 B.C." as erroneously said (Smith, *Dict. Biogr.* i. 793), but the *floruit* of Telesilla, (cp. Clinton, *ad ann.*).

Σπαρτιήτας. The Spartan tradition completely ignores assistance or allies; but c. 92 *infra* shows that Aigina and Sikyon at least took part in it, even if the *συμμάχων στρατιά* in Pausan. 3. 4, 1 is an error (Busolt, ii. 49 n.[3]). Anyway, it is hardly to be supposed that this war was undertaken on the sole initiative of the king, or kings (c. 56 *supra*). The Delphic direction would weigh more with the Spartans generally (cp. 5. 63) than with Kleomenes, who knew how to procure such things. The strategy may have been of Kleomenes, the policy was Sparta's.

3. **λέγεται**, cp. c. 74 *supra*. Hdt. does not write as though he had been in Argos: his doubt, however, might be on the connexion of the river with the lake. The Stymphālis Limne is in N.E. Arkadia, under Mt. Kyllene, and empties through a katavothra or subterranean channel: the drainage there is to the Gulf of Corinth. The river Erasinos issues from Mt. Chaon and flows into the Gulf of Argos, S.W. of the city. The distance between the two points may be some 25 or 30 miles E. as the crow flies, but not as the water flows. Diodorus 15. 49 gives it as 200 stades (= *c.* 23 miles), and Rawlinson note *ad l.* says this is 25 miles short. It seems difficult to believe that the waters of the Erasinos really flow out of the lake of Stymphalos, and it is noticeable that Hdt. by no means commits himself to that theory, generally prevalent in ancient and modern times. The Arkadian water with almost this single exception finds its way westwards. Cp. Bursian, *Geogr. v. Gr.* ii. 186.

7. **αὐτῷ**, the river god. His daughters, Anton. Lib. 40 ("sonst unbekannt," Schultz *apud* Roscher, *Lexikon*, *sub v.*), would be water-nymphs, like the Danaids. The sacrifice was, perhaps, something less than a bull. Cp. c. 56 *supra*.

ἐκαλλιέρεε. The *διαβατήρια* were unfavourable—as when Pausanias did not choose to cross Asopos, 9. 36. That there were other reasons for the strategic action in each case is more than probable. If when Kleomenes reached the Erasinos there were from six to eight thousand Argive hoplites on the opposite bank, the 'citizens' who were 'saved by the Erasinos' were not all Argives. But cp. note *infra*.

8. **ἔφη.** Kleomenes had a Laconic tongue. Cp. 5. 72, c. 50 *supra*, Plutarch, *Apophth. Lac.* (*Moralia*, 223 f.) and Appendix VII. § 7.

It may be permissible to add that I well remember the late Rector of Lincoln College (Mark Pattison), in a conversation on "Greek wit," citing this jest as one of the best *mots* in the literature.

11. **τῇ θαλάσσῃ**, presumably Poseidon.

Τίρυνθος, χώρῳ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κέεται Ἡσίπεια οὔνομα, μεταίχμιον οὐ μέγα ἀπολιπόντες ἵζοντο ἀντίοι τοῖσι Λακεδαιμονίοισι. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ οἱ Ἀργεῖοι τὴν μὲν ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ μάχην οὐκ ἐφοβέοντο, ἀλλὰ μὴ δόλῳ αἱρεθέωσι· καὶ γὰρ δή σφι ἐς τοῦτο τὸ πρῆγμα εἶχε τὸ χρηστήριον τὸ ἐπίκοινα ἔχρησε ἡ Πυθίη τούτοισί τε καὶ Μιλησίοισι, λέγον ὧδε·

> ἀλλ' ὅταν ἡ θήλεια τὸν ἄρσενα νικήσασα
> ἐξελάσῃ καὶ κῦδος ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἄρηται,

Cp. *τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης ἱερὰ ῥέζον | ταύρους παμμέλανας ἐνοσίχθονι κυανοχαίτῃ*, *Od.* 3. 5 f. The Erasinos lay to the S.W. of Argos, and Thyrea still further S. Nauplia, Tiryns, and Sepeia or Hesepeia to the S.E. The bottoms used on this occasion to cross the gulf of Argos were supplied in part from Sikyon and Aigina, c. 92 *infra*. They must have been summoned in good time, even if the galleys from Sikyon were run across the isthmos (cp. Thuc. 3. 15, 8, 7. 8). It looks as if we had in this passage an imperfect and distorted tradition of a brilliant strategic combination, projected and carried out by Kleomenes, the demonstration on the Erasinos being a feint to draw the Argives from the city. It was then perhaps an inversion of the plan pursued in 509 B.C. against Athens. Cp. 5. 63 *supra*.

77. 3. **μεταίχμιον**, c. 112 *infra*. Near enough to hear the herald, who, perhaps, on this occasion was marked out for the service by his loud voice (c. 60 *supra*). But see note on *προσημαίνοι*, l. 16 *infra*.

6. **ἐφοβέοντο.** The Argives were not afraid of a pitched battle with the Spartans, they were afraid of a ruse, because the oracle had warned them that "when the female prevailed over the male, driving him out and getting glory of Argives, women in Argos would deface themselves, and posterity would have to say: 'dread wreathed serpent perished by spear o'ercome.'"

7. **ἐπίκοινα.** The *παρενθήκη ἐς Μιλησίους* has been given, c. 19 *supra*.

9. **ἀλλ' ὅταν κτλ.** It cannot be denied that this oracle is obscure enough "to be regarded as a genuine Pythian response" (see Rawlinson, note *ad l.*). Cp. 7. 111. It is obscure enough to have been really prophetic; in fact there have been many genuine prophecies less obscure. It does not, however, follow that "it is hopeless to attempt a rational explanation of this oracle": on the contrary, rational explanations are not far to seek.

A. Favourable to Argos. She of Argos shall defeat and drive out him of Lakedaimon, but it will cost the Argive women dear: 'twill be a Kadmean victory: posterity will account that day the ruin of Argive power. The only doubt that could arise would be: who was the female of Argos: but the goddess (Hera) supplies the answer.

B. Unfavourable to Argos. Sparta (female) shall conquer Argos (male), (but see *infra*). The women of Argos shall make lamentation. Posterity will date the ruin of Argos from that day. The only obscurity left in this case lies in the word *ἐξελάσῃ*. In neither case is it easy to see how the oracle should rouse a suspicion of a ruse or trick, though a trick was certainly perpetrated on the Argives.

Taking either of these interpretations the oracle would be a remarkable prediction, and substantially consonant with the event. The first interpretation, however, promises victory of a kind to Argos for which there is no room or justification in the narrative of Hdt., unless indeed the first lines be applied to the expulsion of Kleomenes by Hera (c. 82 *infra*), and form a sort of *ὕστερον πρότερον*. The second interpretation leaves nothing to be desired but an explanation of *ἐξελάσῃ*, and even this might be found by referring *ἡ θήλεια* to Hera, and quoting c. 82 *infra*, as above. The authenticity and genuinely prophetic character of the response will then stand and fall with the credibility of the events narrated in c. 82 *infra*. They are incredible, see notes *ad l. c.*

C. There is a third possible explanation of the oracle, which leaves no

πολλὰς Ἀργείων ἀμφιδρυφέας τότε θήσει.
ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει καὶ ἐπεσσομένων ἀνθρώπων
"δεινὸς ὄφις ἀέλικτος ἀπώλετο δουρὶ δαμασθείς."

ταῦτα δὴ πάντα συνελθόντα τοῖσι Ἀργείοισι φόβον παρεῖχε. καὶ δή σφι πρὸς ταῦτα ἔδοξε τῷ κήρυκι τῶν πολεμίων χρᾶσθαι, δόξαν δέ σφι ἐποίεον τοιόνδε· ὅκως ὁ Σπαρτιήτης κῆρυξ προσημαίνοι τι Λακεδαιμονίοισι, ἐποίευν καὶ οἱ Ἀργεῖοι τὠυτὸ τοῦτο.

---

obscurity whatever. This explanation, however, involves the conclusion that for the truth, the whole truth, we must look elsewhere than to the story of the Argive war as told by Hdt. In this explanation the female of Argos becomes Telesilla the poetess, who, according to another tradition, with the women of Argos succeeded in driving Kleomenes out of the town, after he had defeated the men of Argos in a pitched battle. This story is indeed "incompatible with the statements of Herodotos," but it does not follow that Grote is right in concluding that "the story probably grew up out of the oracle itself." It is possible that the oracle grew up out of the story, and that the story was substantially true. So Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* ii.[3] p. 21, 510 B.C., after quoting the authorities for the exploit of Telesilla (Plutarch, *Virt. Mul.* p. 245 D E, Pausanias 2. 20, 8), adds: "Herodotus confirms the fact by recording the oracle to which it gave occasion." The oracle is plainly a *vaticinium post eventum* in Clinton's opinion. That the traditions in Pausanias and Plutarch are from an Argive source (Sokrates of Argos), while the story in Hdt. is in the main Spartan, is a further suggestion of Duncker's, which helps to explain the discrepancies. The fact that Sokrates was a late author does not make it improbable that traditions preserved through him are primitive or early: every one now sees that we are largely indebted to the latest authors (Strabo, Pausanias, Plutarch *et al.*) for our knowledge of primitive and early traditions, legends, myths, customs, and historic facts.

D. Two other interpretations suggest themselves as explaining the origin of the response—either of which gives a much clearer sense and application: (*a*) Assuming that ἡ θήλεια means Hera, and so Argos, the verses might refer to war between Argos and Epidauros, with which place the serpent was early associated. Asklepios, if not himself actually a serpent, might be represented by a serpent. Cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* 360, Mähly, *Die Schlange im Mythus etc.*, p. 8. (*b*) Finally, it may be asked whether this oracle had originally anything to say to Argos and Hera, much less to Kleomenes or Telesilla, at all? The ὄφις was notoriously associated with Athene (4. 189 *supra*, cp. 8. 41, 55), and the victory of the female over the male was her victory (Erechtheus, Erichthonios = Poseidon on the one side, and the ὄφις or δράκων on the other). The transfer of this old enigma to Argos may have been facilitated by the Homeric use of the word Ἀργεῖοι. It is not unlikely that the Delphic versifiers had a stock of such ready-made riddles on hand.

13. **δεινός**, though found in Hdt. coupled with σοφός, in epic or oracular language must be taken in its older meaning 'dread.'

ὄφις. Stein interprets as the crest or symbol of Argos, the enchorial hero (Ἀργειφόντης = ὀφιοκτόνος). Cp. Soph. *Ant.* 125, Eurip. *Phoen.* 1137. As Busolt remarks (*Gr. G.* i.[2] 214 n.) the proper crest of the city of Argos was the wolf, or wolf's-head (cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 366); but that would hardly be a reason against interpreting the ὄφις here to stand for Argos. And it may be added that Sepeia, or Hesepeia, is another point of suggestion between the oracle and the event (σήψ = ὄφις).

ἀέλικτος (ἀ intensive), the better reading, may be taken as equivalent to the vulgate τριέλικτος.

14. **ταῦτα πάντα** seems vague. Cp. πάντα ταῦτα 5. 36 *supra*.

16. **προσημαίνοι.** The signal may have been given by a horn or trumpet. Cp. L. & S.[7] *sub v.* σημαίνω, II. 2.

μαθὼν δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ποιεῦντας τοὺς Ἀργείους ὁκοῖόν τι ὁ 78
σφέτερος κῆρυξ σημήνειε, παραγγέλλει σφι, ὅταν σημήνῃ ὁ κῆρυξ
ποιέεσθαι ἄριστον, τότε ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὅπλα χωρέειν ἐς τοὺς
Ἀργείους. ταῦτα καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπιτελέα ἐκ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων·
ἄριστον γὰρ ποιευμένοισι τοῖσι Ἀργείοισι ἐκ τοῦ κηρύγματος
ἐπεκέατο, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐφόνευσαν αὐτῶν, πολλῷ δέ τι πλεῦνας
ἐς τὸ ἄλσος τοῦ Ἄργου καταφυγόντας περιιζόμενοι ἐφύλασσον.
ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐποίεε τοιόνδε. ἔχων αὐτομόλους ἄνδρας 79
καὶ πυνθανόμενος τούτων, ἐξεκάλεε πέμπων κήρυκα ὀνομαστὶ
λέγων τῶν Ἀργείων τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ ἀπεργμένους, ἐξεκάλεε δὲ
φὰς αὐτῶν ἔχειν τὰ ἄποινα. ἄποινα δέ ἐστι Πελοποννησίοισι δύο
μνέαι τεταγμέναι κατ᾽ ἄνδρα αἰχμάλωτον ἐκτίνειν. κατὰ πεντή-
κοντα δὴ ὦν τῶν Ἀργείων ὡς ἑκάστους ἐκκαλεύμενος ὁ Κλεο-
μένης ἔκτεινε. ταῦτα δέ κως γινόμενα ἐλελήθεε τοὺς λοιποὺς
τοὺς ἐν τῷ τεμένεϊ· ἅτε γὰρ πυκνοῦ ἐόντος τοῦ ἄλσεος, οὐκ ὥρων
οἱ ἐντὸς τοὺς ἐκτὸς ὅ τι ἔπρησσον, πρίν γε δὴ αὐτῶν τις ἀνα-
βὰς ἐπὶ δένδρος κατεῖδε τὸ ποιεύμενον. οὔκων δὴ ἔτι καλεό-
μενοι ἐξήισαν. ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐκέλευε πάντα 80
τινὰ τῶν εἱλωτέων περινέειν ὕλῃ τὸ ἄλσος, τῶν δὲ πειθομένων
ἐνέπρησε τὸ ἄλσος. καιομένου δὲ ἤδη ἐπείρετο τῶν τινα
αὐτομόλων τίνος εἴη θεῶν τὸ ἄλσος· ὁ δὲ ἔφη Ἄργου εἶναι. ὁ
δὲ ὡς ἤκουσε, ἀναστενάξας μέγα εἶπε "ὦ Ἄπολλον χρηστήριε,

---

78. 2. **παραγγέλλει.** How the *παράγγελσις* in a Spartan army would be carried out is explained by Thucydides, 5. 66. Cp. Xenoph. *Rep. Laced.* xii. 6.

4. **ταῦτα.** According to another account, which well illustrates the casuistry of swearing, Kleomenes fooled the Argives by a device more discreditable to him than to them. Having agreed to a truce for seven *days* he attacked them on the third *night* (Plutarch, *Apophth. Lac.* Kleom. = *Mor.* 223). Being reproached for a breach of faith he replied that the nights had not been included in the oath: *ἄλλως τε καὶ ὅ τι ἂν κακόν τις ποιῇ τοὺς πολεμίους τοῦτο καὶ παρὰ θεοῖς καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δίκης ὑπέρτερον νομίζεσθαι*—a sophistication which cuts at the root of all truces. See further, 4. 201 *supra*. The two stories are not strictly incompatible, but either is enough to explain the event; and the Herodotean looks rather like a Spartan version devised to disguise the king's breach of faith.

79. 1. **αὐτομόλους ἄνδρας** suggests that treachery too was at work. They could hardly have furnished him with the names of all the six thousand, or even the majority (*πολλῷ δέ τι πλεῦνας*), but they might have given fifty names. The herald, a sacred personage, was not necessarily privy to the deceit: unless he was sent in to call each one separately.

4. **ἄποινα.** The tariff was not confined to the Peloponnesos, cp. 5. 77 *supra*.

7. **ἐλελήθεε.** The passage is a curious anticipation of the story in Thucydides, 3. 81, 4. 47 f.

80. 5. **ἀναστενάξας μέγα εἶπε.** The sudden conversion of this impious madman, who knew that oracles could be purchased, and afterwards bought one (c. 66 *supra*), had just forsworn himself, had lied through the sacred lips of the herald, had committed sacrilege at Athens (5. 72 *supra*), at Eleusis (c. 75 *supra*), and presently recommits it in the Heraion (c. 82 *infra*), who was indeed consciously committing one at this moment in firing a sacred grove, to a conviction of the fulfilment of prophecy, and a shaping of his conduct thereto, would be more credible

ἢ μεγάλως με ἠπάτηκας φάμενος Ἄργος αἱρήσειν· συμβάλλομαι
81 *δ' ἐξήκειν μοι τὸ χρηστήριον." μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Κλεομένης τὴν*
μὲν πλέω στρατιὴν ἀπῆκε ἀπιέναι ἐς Σπάρτην, χιλίους δὲ αὐτὸς
λαβὼν τοὺς ἀριστέας ἤιε ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον θύσων· βουλόμενον δὲ
αὐτὸν θύειν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ὁ ἱρεὺς ἀπηγόρευε, φὰς οὐκ ὅσιον
εἶναι ξείνῳ αὐτόθι θύειν. ὁ δὲ Κλεομένης τὸν ἱρέα ἐκέλευε τοὺς
εἵλωτας ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἀπάγοντας μαστιγῶσαι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔθυσε·
82 *ποιήσας δὲ ταῦτα ἀπήιε ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην. νοστήσαντα δέ μιν*
ὑπῆγον οἱ ἐχθροὶ ὑπὸ τοὺς ἐφόρους, φάμενοί μιν δωροδοκήσαντα
οὐκ ἑλεῖν τὸ Ἄργος, παρεὸν εὐπετέως μιν ἑλεῖν. ὁ δέ σφι ἔλεξε,
οὔτε εἰ ψευδόμενος οὔτε εἰ ἀληθέα λέγων, ἔχω σαφηνέως εἶπαι,
ἔλεξε δ' ὦν φάμενος, ἐπείτε δὴ τὸ τοῦ Ἄργου ἱρὸν εἷλον, δοκέειν
οἱ ἐξεληλυθέναι τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ χρησμόν· πρὸς ὦν ταῦτα οὐ δικαιοῦν

---

if (1) there did not exist, outside Herodotus, a tradition of the Spartan king's conduct on this occasion, more consonant with probability, and (2) if there were not forthcoming an obvious explanation of the silence of Hdt. and of the origin of the Herodotean story. The story here is "the official Spartan" (Duncker, vii.[5] 75, Busolt, ii. 49 notes), or at any rate it is a pragmatic version, in which the facts have been manipulated in a way to suit Spartan interests and houour. Cp. notes on c. 82 *infra*.

81. 2. **ἀπῆκε ἀπιέναι.** Cp. c. 62 *supra ad fin.* Why Kleomenes should have been in such a hurry to dismiss the army, before making an attempt on the city, keeping a picked thousand (*ἀριστέας*, poetical), more than enough for protection, and less than enough for a storm or a siege, is not adequately explained even by the story which follows in c. 82, for the truth of which Hdt. declines to be responsible.

3. **τὸ Ἥραιον.** The temple of Argive Hera was not in the city, but situate some 45 stadia from Argos (cp. 1. 31) across the plain, eastwards, on the spur of the mountains. Cp. Strabo, 368; Pausan. 2. 17; Bursian, *Geogr. Gr.* ii. 47; Baedeker, *Greece*, p. 253; and especially Waldstein, *Excavations at the Heraion of Argos*, No. i. (1892). The Heraion entered by Kleomenes was burnt down in the summer of 423 B.C. (Thuc. 4. 133). The new temple was a little lower down the hill, but not enough to affect the measurements of distance.

4. **ἀπηγόρευε.** The incident recalls the similar adventure on the Athenian Akropolis. Kleomenes had treated the Athenian lady with more courtesy than the Argive priest, 5. 72. But where was the priestess of Hera (1. 31) on this occasion?

82. 2. **οἱ ἐχθροί.** Kleomenes had enemies in Sparta: who were they? Were not Demaratos and his partisans among them? Cp. Appendix VII. §§ 5, 9.

ἐφόρους. The king, even in the days of Kleomenes, is admittedly responsible (*ὑπεύθυνος*) for the military conduct of affairs in the field: yet we are asked to believe that the Spartan king could still at this time decide questions of peace and war (c. 56 *supra*), *i.e.* of policy. It is, however, very doubtful whether the Ephors alone constituted the court, which was more probably composed of the Gerusia, Ephors, and perhaps the other king. Cp. Pausanias 3. 5, 2 (*à propos* his namesake, *anno* 403 B.C.) *βασιλεῖ δὲ τῷ Λακεδαιμονίων δικαστήριον ἐκάθιζον οἵ τε ὀνομαζόμενοι γέροντες ὀκτὼ καὶ εἴκοσιν ὄντες ἀριθμόν, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐφόρων ἀρχή, σὺν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ὁ τῆς οἰκίας βασιλεὺς τῆς ἑτέρας.* Cp. Gilbert, *Staatsalt.* i.[2] p. 60 and c. 85 *infra*.

δωροδοκήσαντα. *δωροδοκία* was the convenient hypothesis to explain all miscarriages of arms or of justice (cp. c. 72 *supra*); but judging by Kleomenes' other acts he was capable of taking the gifts and Argos too.

3. **εὐπετέως.** From a military point of view the criticism seems just. At least there was nothing earthly to excuse Kleomenes for omitting to make

πειρᾶν τῆς πόλιος, πρίν γε δὴ ἱροῖσι χρήσηται καὶ μάθῃ εἴτε οἱ ὁ θεὸς παραδιδοῖ εἴτε ἐμποδὼν ἕστηκε· καλλιερευμένῳ δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἡραίῳ ἐκ τοῦ ἀγάλματος τῶν στηθέων φλόγα πυρὸς ἐκλάμψαι, μαθεῖν δὲ αὐτὸς οὕτω τὴν ἀτρεκείην, ὅτι οὐκ αἱρέει τὸ Ἄργος. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ἀγάλματος ἐξέλαμψε, αἱρέειν ἂν κατ' ἄκρης τὴν πόλιν, ἐκ τῶν στηθέων δὲ λάμψαντος πᾶν οἱ πεποιῆσθαι ὅσον ὁ θεὸς ἐβούλετο γενέσθαι. ταῦτα λέγων πιστά τε καὶ οἰκότα ἐδόκεε Σπαρτιήτῃσι λέγειν, καὶ διέφυγε πολλὸν τοὺς διώκοντας.

---

an attempt on the city, in the events as reported to Herodotus.

13. **ὁ θεός.** ἡ θεὸς might have been expected, but cp. c. 27 *supra*. The ἄγαλμα which Kleomenes saw was perhaps the ἄγαλμα Ἥρας ἀρχαῖον ἐπὶ κίονος which Pausanias afterwards saw (2. 17, 5), and which apparently survived the conflagration of 423 B.C.

14. **διέφυγε.** From the emphasis which Hdt. lays on the statement it may be inferred that Kleomenes on his return from the Argive campaign was really brought to trial by Demaratos, or others, for failing to capture the city, and that the story of the portent in the Heraion was one of the pleas set up in defence, and helped to procure, or to excuse, his acquittal. It may also be conjectured that the oracles above given (cc. 76, 77) did duty upon this occasion, and may even have been procured by Kleomenes for the very purpose, perhaps through his friends, the αὐτόμολοι ἄνδρες, perhaps direct from Delphi. Hera had driven Kleomenes out by the flames of fire from her breast, but still he had won a great victory, the fame of which would be on the lips of posterity, for valour, not for guile.

In the story of the Argive campaign we have, therefore, a more or less official account of the affair, and an explanation, satisfactory to the Spartan government and folk (πιστά τε καὶ οἰκότα), of the failure to capture Argos after a victory in the field. Those who cannot share the Spartan view of the verisimilitude of the defence of Kleomenes, should be driven to the hypothesis of δωροδοκία, if there were no other alternative forthcoming. The Argive tradition supplies one, according to which Kleomenes, as was to be expected, after his victory advanced against the city, but was repulsed by the valour of the Argive women headed by Telesilla. That this account in its turn contains exaggerations, is very likely: the question however is whether it does not contain some matter of fact, ignored conveniently in the story told at Sparta. Women have taken part in military operations, especially defensive and siege operations, or street-fighting (cp. Thuc. 3. 74), and it was on a similar occasion in Argos that Pyrrhos received a fatal blow at a woman's hand, Plutarch, *Pyrrh.* 34. That Demaratos played a part in the Argive war, entered the town, and was obliged to retire, is also a point in the tradition which cannot be dismissed as improbable (Plutarch, *Virt. Mul.* 4). It would have been a fresh ground of enmity between the kings, especially if Demaratos had reason to suspect that Kleomenes had deliberately left him in the lurch. The presence of Demaratos would be difficult to reconcile with the law recorded 5. 75 *supra*, and there dated c. 508 B.C. if the Argive war is correctly dated to 495/4 B.C. or to any year after the fiasco at Eleusis. But it is more than reasonable to suppose that the law is incorrectly dated, and that it was really passed, if ever formally passed, on this later occasion, which should be inserted in the recital, c. 64 *supra*, *ad fin.* Cp. Appendix VII. § 10. That the Argive tradition is simply a product of Argive vanity in later times, as Manso suggests (*Sparta*, I. ii. pp. 292 ff.), moved thereto by the silence of Herodotus, is a conclusion based on an imperfect appreciation of the sources and methods of our author. Manso, indeed, argued that Telesilla and the women had the will to defend the city, but were not called upon to act, because a bribe did their business. That the action of the women was exaggerated, that it was put afterwards into an artificial relation to the ancient

83 Ἄργος δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐχηρώθη οὕτω ὥστε οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτῶν ἔσχον πάντα τὰ πρήγματα ἄρχοντές τε καὶ διέποντες, ἐς ὃ ἐπήβησαν οἱ τῶν ἀπολομένων παῖδες· ἔπειτά σφεας οὗτοι ἀνακτώμενοι ὀπίσω ἐς ἑωυτοὺς τὸ Ἄργος ἐξέβαλον· ἐξωθεύμενοι δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι μάχῃ ἔσχον Τίρυνθα. τέως μὲν δή σφι ἦν ἄρθμια ἐς

---

festival of the Hybristika (Plutarch, *Mor.* 245), that there were still men left to defend the town—all that is likely enough. What is more improbable is that the Spartans after a great victory, and after an expectation of the total destruction of Argos, should have turned back without attempting the town. The matter is fully discussed by Duncker, vii. 72 ff., and his suggestions virtually accepted by Busolt, ii. 48 ff. It should be remembered that Clinton, *Fasti, ad an.* 510 B.C., and Thirlwall, *Hist.* ii. 291 ff., accept the (Argive) traditions as substantially true. On the actual losses of the Argives see next chapter.

83. 1. **ἀνδρῶν** (cp. 4. 1 *supra*). Elsewhere incidentally Hdt. gives the exact number as 6000 (7. 148), Pausanias (3. 4, 1) as under 5000. The later Argive tradition gave 7777, a number the absurdity but not the origin of which was perceived by Plutarch (*Virt. Mul.* 4 = *Mor.* 245). The last number may have been derived from sacral sources, in connexion with the 'Hybristika,' which was brought into artificial relation to the exploit of the Argive women against the Spartans, and to the same ultimate source (in Semitic ritual) may be due the number seven in the truce of Kleomenes and the Argives, and in the day of the month ("the seventh," Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 3, 7, 1303[a], Plutarch, *l. c.*), on which the battle was fought, according to tradition. So Duncker. The most modest estimate is probably the truest, though Argos might probably have survived a loss of even 6000 hoplites. Accurate estimates of the Argive citizens are for a later period. Cp. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der Gr.-Röm. Welt*, pp. 116 ff., Clinton, *Fasti*, ii.[3] p. 517.

οἱ δοῦλοι. This remarkable but brief notice of the Servile Interregnum at Argos can hardly be other than an exaggeration and misconception of the relations between (Dorian) Argos and the Perioiki (Orneatae, 8. 73) brought about by the great disaster 'on the seventh, and the consequent changes in the political constitution of the state (cp. Plutarch, *Mor.* 245). Tiryns (and Mykenae) may, perhaps, be regarded, by this time, as strongholds of the non-Dorian elements in Argolis. (Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 213, appears to regard them as "originally" under Dorian dynasties, Tiryns however soon becoming dependent on Argos, Mykenae not so.) The victory of Kleomenes had benefited these places directly or indirectly: they recovered independence. Though Argos was neutral in the Persian wars, Mykenae and Tiryns sent hoplites to Plataia, 9. 28, and their names were inscribed on the τρικάρηνος ὄφις, 9. 81. Cp. Hicks, *Manual*, No. 12, Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, No. 1. But Argos was nursing her strength during her long neutrality: in the war which ensued, though Argos may have had hard work (μόγις), yet Mykenae and Tiryns were practically annihilated (*c.* 468 B.C. Duncker, viii. 123 n., 136. Busolt, ii. 371, 376 n., 377, 440, separates, with great probability, the reduction of Tiryns from the reduction of Mykenae, dating the latter *c.* 465 B.C.) The defeat in 494 B.C. may also have left its mark upon the inner constitution of Argos, and the 'servile régime' may betoken not merely the emancipation of the *Perioiki* (Aristot. 8. 3, 7, 1303[a]), but the enfranchisement of a goodly number in Argos itself, with the inevitable result of a development of democracy, which remained practically a permanent characteristic of Argos, whatever its relations to other centres in Argolis. Thus the victory of Sparta 494 B.C. was in the long run fatal to Spartan, to Dorian, to oligarchic interests in Argos, and Argos becomes thereafter a focus for the democratic propaganda and a centre for anti-Spartan intrigues in the Peloponnesos, the clearest, but by no means the only, glimpse of which we obtain, for a much later period, in Thuc. 5. 27 ff. Cp. Busolt, *Forschungen* (1880), pp. 75 ff. For πάντα τὰ πρήγματα cp. Thuc. 2. 65, 4.

ἀλλήλους, ἔπειτα δὲ ἐς τοὺς δούλους ἦλθε ἀνὴρ μάντις Κλέανδρος, γένος ἐὼν Φιγαλεὺς ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης· οὗτος τοὺς δούλους ἀνέγνωσε ἐπιθέσθαι τοῖσι δεσπότῃσι. ἐκ τούτου δὴ πόλεμός σφι ἦν ἐπὶ χρόνον συχνόν, ἐς ὃ δὴ μόγις οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἐπεκράτησαν.

84 Ἀργεῖοι μέν νυν διὰ ταῦτα Κλεομένεά φασι μανέντα ἀπολέσθαι κακῶς· αὐτοὶ δὲ Σπαρτιῆταί φασι ἐκ δαιμονίου μὲν οὐδενὸς μανῆναι Κλεομένεα, Σκύθῃσι δὲ ὁμιλήσαντά μιν ἀκρητοπότην γενέσθαι καὶ ἐκ τούτου μανῆναι. Σκύθας γὰρ τοὺς νομάδας, ἐπείτε σφι Δαρεῖον ἐμβαλεῖν ἐς τὴν χώρην, μετὰ ταῦτα μεμονέναι μιν τίσασθαι, πέμψαντας δὲ ἐς Σπάρτην συμμαχίην τε ποιέεσθαι καὶ συντίθεσθαι ὡς χρεὸν εἴη αὐτοὺς μὲν τοὺς Σκύθας παρὰ Φᾶσιν ποταμὸν πειρᾶν ἐς τὴν Μηδικὴν ἐσβάλλειν, σφέας δὲ τοὺς Σπαρτιήτας κελεύειν ἐξ Ἐφέσου ὁρμωμένους ἀναβαίνειν καὶ ἔπειτα ἐς τὠυτὸ ἀπαντᾶν. Κλεομένεα δὲ λέγουσι ἡκόντων τῶν Σκυθέων ἐπὶ ταῦτα ὁμιλέειν σφι μεζόνως, ὁμιλέοντα δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ἱκνεομένου μαθεῖν τὴν ἀκρητοποσίην παρ' αὐτῶν· ἐκ τούτου δὲ μανῆναί μιν νομίζουσι Σπαρτιῆται. ἔκ τε τόσου, ὡς αὐτοὶ

---

7. **Φιγαλεύς.** Of Phigaleia, on the S.W. of Arkadia, close to the borders of Messenia: a town renowned for the cult of the horse-headed Demeter, which drew Pausanias to visit the place (8. 42, 5), whither modern travellers are likely to be attracted by the beautiful ruins of the temple of Apollo Epikurios (at Bassae), the frieze of which may be seen in the British Museum. This Arkadian diviner is one of a class of adventurers, other specimens of which are seen in Tisamenos of Elis 9. 33, Hegesistratos 9. 37; Antichares of Eleon 5. 43; Kallias 5. 44. Whether his mission in Argolis had a political purpose, and was sanctioned by Sparta, there is hardly evidence to show.

84. 1. **Ἀργεῖοι . . φασι.** All that the Argives need be supposed to have said is that the doom of Kleomenes was a punishment for the sacrilege against the hero Argos and his sanctuary, c. 75 *supra*. The story of the war (cc. 76-82) is not from Argive tradition. Whether Hdt. had even the Argive 'moral' from an Argive source may be doubted: the Argive view of the case might be easily inferred. Cp. c. 75 *supra*, and Introduction, pp. lxxviii f.

2. **αὐτοὶ δὲ Σπαρτιῆταί φασι.** The Spartans themselves saw nothing supernatural in the mania of Kleomenes; the miracle would have been, had he not gone out of his mind. It was a case of *delirium tremens*. On divine mania, cp. 4. 79, 5. 85 *supra*.

4. **Σκύθας.** This magnificent programme of a joint attack by civilised and uncivilised Europe upon the Asiatic despot surpassed even the combinations of an Aristagoras, cp. 5. 49 *supra*. The Scythian embassy appears to be dated soon after the retreat of Dareios. How little the Scyths could have known of Sparta, or of the state of Hellenic affairs, to appear in Sparta with such proposals! But that any such embassy took place, or that any such proposal was made, is an hypothesis hardly requiring discussion, albeit the idea of a raid on upper Asia is more appropriately fixed on Scythian nomads than upon the astute Milesian. Scyths may have been seen from time to time in Sparta (cp. 4. 77 *supra*), yet the practice of hard drinking, and the synonym therefor, might have found their way to Sparta without a Scythian embassy. If Kleomenes had been an incurable drunkard for twenty years or so before his end, his great plans and achievements, his fame and personality, become astonishing. It is at least possible that the Spartan assertion was a libel.

13. **ἔκ τε τόσου.** The Σκυθικὴ πόσις was not invented in Sparta, and the verb has been brought into a pragmatic

λέγουσι, ἐπεὰν ζωρότερον βούλωνται πιεῖν, "ἐπισκύθισον" λέγουσι. οὕτω δὴ Σπαρτιῆται τὰ περὶ Κλεομένεα λέγουσι· ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκέει τίσιν ταύτην ὁ Κλεομένης Δημαρήτῳ ἐκτῖσαι.

85 Τελευτήσαντος δὲ Κλεομένεος ὡς ἐπύθοντο Αἰγινῆται, ἔπεμπον ἐς Σπάρτην ἀγγέλους καταβωσομένους Λευτυχίδεω περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ὁμήρων ἐχομένων. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ δικαστήριον συναγαγόντες ἔγνωσαν περιυβρίσθαι Αἰγινήτας ὑπὸ Λευτυχίδεω, καί μιν κατέκριναν ἔκδοτον ἄγεσθαι ἐς Αἴγιναν ἀντὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ἐχομένων ἀνδρῶν. μελλόντων δὲ ἄγειν τῶν Αἰγινητέων τὸν Λευτυχίδεα, εἶπέ σφι Θεασίδης ὁ Λεωπρέπεος, ἐὼν ἐν Σπάρτῃ δόκιμος ἀνήρ, "τί βουλεύεσθε ποιέειν, ἄνδρες Αἰγινῆται; τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Σπαρτιητέων ἔκδοτον γενόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν πολιητέων ἄγειν; εἰ νῦν ὀργῇ χρεώμενοι ἔγνωσαν οὕτω Σπαρτιῆται, ὅκως ἐξ

---

relation to the supposed Scythian embassy, cp. Appendix VII. § 7.

85. 1. τελευτήσαντος. The restoration and death of Kleomenes must be placed after Marathon. See Appendices VII. § 6, VIII. § 5. But his exile may, perhaps, have taken place before Marathon. If the Aiginetans seized the earliest possible opportunity of remonstrating at Sparta, the trial of Leotychides, and his mission to Athens, might be dated still to the summer of 490 B.C. But the express date of Hdt. for these events, 'after the death of Kleomenes,' and even more the general perspective, and the difficulty of finding room for these affairs while the Persian fleet was already in the Aegean, make it more reasonable to suppose that Hdt. here unconsciously anticipates events. Cp. c. 94 *infra*, and Appendices *ll. c.*

3. **δικαστήριον.** The composition of this *δικαστήριον* which sat in judgment on the king, it would be interesting to determine. The Ephors alone apparently had sat in judgment on Kleomenes (c. 82 *supra*, but cp. note *ad l.*), and in the present case the phrase *δ. συναγαγόντες* points to something more composite. Was the court made up of the Ephors and Gerontes? (cp. 5. 40 *supra*, with the addition of Leonidas?). Or was the question, as the matter was an 'international' one, referred to a religious tribunal? Or was it a popular court, of the whole Apella maybe? (*ἔκδοτον γενόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν πολιητέων*). In any case the decision looks grossly unjust, for Leotychides had only performed a duty to Hellas, and probably under authority from the government, cp. cc. 49, 50 *supra*. Had he too his enemies in Sparta, who were prepared to find or make an excuse for dethroning him? At best the decision looks like a political not a judicial one. That the Spartans should take hostages of the Aiginetans and hand them over to the Athenians as pledges for Aiginetan good behaviour, and then shortly after completely reverse their attitude and recover or attempt to recover the hostages from Athens, unless something important had happened meanwhile, is not likely. Supposing the seizure of the hostages to have taken place in 491/90 B.C., and the application for their restoration three or four years later, a great deal had happened, enough indeed fully to account for a complete reversal of policy at Sparta. Athens had defeated the Persian at Marathon, had assaulted Paros and the Kyklades, and was showing signs of self-aggrandizement. Sparta on the other hand had taken nothing by the repulse of the Barbarian, and had narrowly escaped a domestic revolution. Egypt perhaps was in revolt; Dareios was nearing his end; there was no immediate danger of a return of the Persian. To set the Aiginetans free, to revive Dorian interests in the island, might seem, under altered circumstances, no bad stroke of policy.

7. **Θεασίδης** may have been one of the *πρόξενοι*. Cp. c. 57 *supra*.

10. **ὅκως . . μή . . ἐμβάλωσι.** Krüger suggested *ἐσβαλεῦσι* as more in

ὑστέρης μή τι ὑμῖν, ἢν ταῦτα πρήσσητε, πανώλεθρον κακὸν ἐς
τὴν χώρην ἐμβάλωσι.” ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες οἱ Αἰγινῆται ἔσχοντο
τῆς ἀγωγῆς, ὁμολογίῃ δὲ ἐχρήσαντο τοιῇδε, ἐπισπόμενον Λευτυ-
χίδεα ἐς Ἀθήνας ἀποδοῦναι Αἰγινήτῃσι τοὺς ἄνδρας. ὡς δὲ 86
ἀπικόμενος Λευτυχίδης ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀπαίτεε τὴν παραθήκην,
οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι προφάσιας εἷλκον οὐ βουλόμενοι ἀποδοῦναι,
φάντες δύο σφέας ἐόντας βασιλέας παραθέσθαι καὶ οὐ δικαιοῦν
τῷ ἑτέρῳ ἄνευ τοῦ ἑτέρου ἀποδιδόναι· οὐ φαμένων δὲ ἀποδώσειν
τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἔλεξέ σφι Λευτυχίδης τάδε. “ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, a)
ποιέετε μὲν ὁκότερα βούλεσθε αὐτοί· καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδόντες ποιέετε
ὅσια, καὶ μὴ ἀποδιδόντες τὰ ἐναντία τούτων· ὁκοῖον μέντοι τι ἐν
τῇ Σπάρτῃ συνηνείχθη γενέσθαι περὶ παρακαταθήκης, βούλομαι
ὑμῖν εἶπαι. λέγομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ Σπαρτιῆται γενέσθαι ἐν τῇ Λακε-
δαίμονι κατὰ τρίτην γενεὴν τὴν ἀπ' ἐμέο Γλαῦκον Ἐπικύδεος
παῖδα· τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα φαμὲν τά τε ἄλλα πάντα περιήκειν τὰ
πρῶτα, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀκούειν ἄριστα δικαιοσύνης πέρι πάντων ὅσοι
τὴν Λακεδαίμονα τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον οἴκεον. συνενειχθῆναι δέ
οἱ ἐν χρόνῳ ἱκνευμένῳ τάδε λέγομεν. ἄνδρα Μιλήσιον ἀπικό-
μενον ἐς Σπάρτην βούλεσθαί οἱ ἐλθεῖν ἐς λόγους προϊσχόμενον

---

accordance with this use of ὅκως μή, and van Herwerden follows him. Cp. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 45, note 7 ; § 46, note 4, Madvig, *Greek Syntax*, § 124 *b*.

13. **ὁμολογίῃ**. Whether this agreement was with Leotychides, or with the Spartan government, does not clearly appear. But it does not seem likely that the king was acting ἄνευ τοῦ κοινοῦ, cp. c. 50 *supra*.

86. 2. **παραθήκην.** Cp. c. 73 *supra*. The diplomatic attitude and reply of the Athenians has a Themistoklean ingenuity about it. Whether, if the other king, Leonidas, had appeared to support Leotychides, the Athenians would have demanded a necromantic authority of Kleomenes, we are left to conjecture : but their statesmen would doubtless at this time have been equal to the occasion.

6. **ἔλεξε . . τάδε.** One hardly knows which more to admire in the speech of Leotychides at Athens, the perfection of the narrative or the inconsequence of the logic. The Athenians doubtless were charmed by the one, but easily evaded the other. It was not so easy for one Spartan to cajole 30,000 Athenians ! (cp. 5. 97 *supra*). The story has a Delphian ring about it : and this moral tale is put into the mouth of a man who had helped to corrupt the Pythia, or profited by her corruption, c. 65 *supra*, and who was afterwards caught tripping, as already narrated in c. 72.

§ **a** l. 9. Van Herwerden reads παραθήκης here, and in acc. l. 28 *infra*, following Rsv and B²; cp. l. 56 *infra*.

11. **τρίτην.** 'The third generation before Leotychides' would be in the days of his grandfather Agesilaos (8. 131) *alias* Agis (c. 65 *supra*), who might be contemporary with the kings Leon and Agesikles, 1. 65, *i.e.* about three quarters of a century before the date of the supposed delivery of this speech, or, in other words, about the date of the end of the reign of Alyattes, when things were going rather ill with the Ionians and Miletos, 1. 17.

13. **δικαιοσύνης**, cp. case of Kadmos 7. 164, and his father Skythes, c. 24 *supra*. With **ἱκνευμένῳ** cp. ἱκνεομένου c. 84 *supra*, and the adverb (*bis*) c. 65 *supra*.

16. **Σπάρτην.** A Milesian comes to Sparta rather than to Athens : the reign of Alyattes, especially the period of the war with Miletos (623-613 B.C. cp. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* § 487), was not a time of security at Athens, coinciding, as it does, very nearly with the days of Kylon and Drakon, cp. 5. 71

τοιάδε. ‘εἰμὶ μὲν Μιλήσιος, ἥκω δὲ τῆς σῆς Γλαῦκε βουλόμενος
δικαιοσύνης ἀπολαῦσαι. ὡς γὰρ δὴ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν μὲν τὴν ἄλλην
Ἑλλάδα, ἐν δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἰωνίην τῆς σῆς δικαιοσύνης ἦν λόγος
πολλός, ἐμεωυτῷ λόγους ἐδίδουν καὶ ὅτι ἐπικίνδυνός ἐστι αἰεί
κοτε ἡ Ἰωνίη, ἡ δὲ Πελοπόννησος ἀσφαλέως ἱδρυμένη, καὶ διότι
χρήματα οὐδαμὰ τοὺς αὐτούς ἐστι ὁρᾶν ἔχοντας. ταῦτά τε ὦν
ἐπιλεγομένῳ καὶ βουλευομένῳ ἔδοξέ μοι τὰ ἡμίσεα πάσης τῆς
οὐσίης ἐξαργυρώσαντα θέσθαι παρὰ σέ, εὖ ἐξεπισταμένῳ ὥς μοι
κείμενα ἔσται παρὰ σοὶ σόα. σὺ δή μοι καὶ τὰ χρήματα δέξαι
καὶ τάδε τὰ σύμβολα σῶζε λαβών· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἔχων ταῦτα
β) ἀπαιτέῃ, τούτῳ ἀποδοῦναι.’ ὁ μὲν δὴ ἀπὸ Μιλήτου ἥκων ξεῖνος
τοσαῦτα ἔλεξε, Γλαῦκος δὲ ἐδέξατο τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἐπὶ τῷ
εἰρημένῳ λόγῳ. χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ διελθόντος ἦλθον ἐς Σπάρτην
τούτου τοῦ παραθεμένου τὰ χρήματα οἱ παῖδες, ἐλθόντες δὲ ἐς
λόγους τῷ Γλαύκῳ καὶ ἀποδεικνύντες τὰ σύμβολα ἀπαίτεον τὰ
χρήματα· ὁ δὲ διωθέετο ἀντυποκρινόμενος τοιάδε. ‘οὔτε μέμνη-
μαι τὸ πρῆγμα οὔτε με περιφέρει οὐδὲν εἰδέναι τούτων τῶν ὑμεῖς
λέγετε, βούλομαί τε ἀναμνησθεὶς ποιέειν πᾶν τὸ δίκαιον· καὶ
γὰρ εἰ ἔλαβον, ὀρθῶς ἀποδοῦναι, καὶ εἴ γε ἀρχὴν μὴ ἔλαβον,
νόμοισι τοῖσι Ἑλλήνων χρήσομαι ἐς ὑμέας. ταῦτα ὦν ὑμῖν
γ) ἀναβάλλομαι κυρώσειν ἐς τέταρτον μῆνα ἀπὸ τοῦδε.’ οἱ μὲν δὴ
Μιλήσιοι συμφορὴν ποιησάμενοι ἀπαλλάσσοντο ὡς ἀπεστερημένοι
τῶν χρημάτων, Γλαῦκος δὲ ἐπορεύετο ἐς Δελφοὺς χρησόμενος τῷ
χρηστηρίῳ. ἐπειρωτῶντα δὲ αὐτὸν τὸ χρηστήριον εἰ ὅρκῳ τὰ
χρήματα ληίσηται, ἡ Πυθίη μετέρχεται τοισίδε τοῖσι ἔπεσι·

---

supra. But in any case Sparta would be a better treasury, and Ionians in Asia had not yet perhaps learnt to regard Athens as their metropolis.

19. **Ἑλλάδα.** The unity of Hellas, as to market and as to moral culture, is observable, as well as the inclusion of Ionia in the term. Cp. 1. 27, and Introduction, p. xxvi.

20. **ἐπικίνδυνος**, partly from the wars with the Mermnadae, cp. 1. 17, partly perhaps from the tyrannis, 1. 20. Later again there were internal troubles in Miletos, cp. 5. 28 *supra*, and a good deal of landed property changed hands under the Parian arbitration, 5. 29 *supra*; this was for two generations before the days of Leotychides.

21. **διότι.** Van Herwerden changes to ὅτι.

27. **ἀποδοῦναι**, infin. for imperat. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* § 474, p. 588.

§ β l. 29. **χρόνου πολλοῦ**, twenty-five or thirty years? Perhaps in the days of Menares, of Anaxandrides and Ariston? Anyway, before the days of Leotychides himself. The words are of course only a phrase in the story-teller's mouth.

36. **νόμοισι τ. Ἑ.**, *i.e.* he would clear himself on oath. Cp. c. 67 *supra*, and Introduction, p. xxvi.

§ γ l. 41. **ἔπεσι.** Possibly the whole story may have been preserved in a poetic form, from which these lines are a quotation. Anyway, the story of Glaukos, and the oracular response, preserved in it, or preserving it, exhibit Hellenic morality in a remarkable phase. The observation that death comes alike to the just and to the unjust has been made: likewise the observation that the wicked man flourishes at times to a remarkable extent. But these observations, which perplex an indi-

Γλαῦκ' Ἐπικυδείδη, τὸ μὲν αὐτίκα κέρδιον οὕτω
ὅρκῳ νικῆσαι καὶ χρήματα ληίσσασθαι.
ὄμνυ, ἐπεὶ θάνατός γε καὶ εὔορκον μένει ἄνδρα.
ἀλλ' ὅρκου πάις ἐστίν, ἀνώνυμος, οὐδ' ἔπι χεῖρες
οὐδὲ πόδες· κραιπνὸς δὲ μετέρχεται, εἰς ὅ κε πᾶσαν
συμμάρψας ὀλέσῃ γενεὴν καὶ οἶκον ἅπαντα.
ἀνδρὸς δ' εὐόρκου γενεὴ μετόπισθεν ἀμείνων.

ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ Γλαῦκος συγγνώμην τὸν θεὸν παραιτέετο αὐτῷ ἴσχειν τῶν ῥηθέντων. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη ἔφη τὸ πειρηθῆναι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι ἴσον δύνασθαι. Γλαῦκος μὲν δὴ μεταπεμψάμενος δ) τοὺς Μιλησίους ξείνους ἀποδιδοῖ σφι τὰ χρήματα. τοῦ δὲ εἵνεκα ὁ λόγος ὅδε ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι ὁρμήθη λέγεσθαι ἐς ὑμέας, εἰρήσεται· Γλαύκου νῦν οὔτε τι ἀπόγονόν ἐστι οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἱστίη οὐδεμία νομιζομένη εἶναι Γλαύκου, ἐκτέτριπταί τε πρόρριζος ἐκ Σπάρτης. οὕτω ἀγαθὸν μηδὲ διανοέεσθαι περὶ παρακαταθήκης ἄλλο γε ἢ ἀπαιτεόντων ἀποδιδόναι."

87 Λευτυχίδης μὲν εἴπας ταῦτα, ὥς οἱ οὐδὲ οὕτω ἐσήκουον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀπαλλάσσετο· οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται, πρὶν τῶν πρότερον ἀδικημάτων δοῦναι δίκας τῶν ἐς Ἀθηναίους ὕβρισαν Θηβαίοισι

---

vidualistic society, gave little trouble at Delphi in old days. The sanction of morality still rested firmly upon the idea of the family, and the need of gentile continuity. In this sanction the belief in another life is involved, for the maintenance of the family is relative to the maintenance of the ancestor-worship, and its corollaries. Still, the complete absence of any appeal to a future Heaven and Hell, or to the personal punishment of the unjust man in the other world, is significant of a pre-Pythagorean stage of thought, and had perhaps a special charm for Hdt. who was no great admirer of the Samian plagiarist. See 4. 95 *supra*.

51. **ἴσον δύνασθαι.** Could the 'internality' of righteousness, and the necessity of the 'good will,' be more strongly affirmed than in this 'lively oracle'? The sequel is tremendous: Glaukos makes restitution, but is not forgiven: his posterity blotted out, and his name become a bye-word. The king proves too much! The Athenians had already 'made occasions for delay,' which betrayed their mind; if the will, not the act, was to be punished, they were already doomed;—supposing, indeed, that their case ran on all fours with the case of Glaukos, and that Leotychides was justified in assuming the *rôle* of the Milesian depositor: a parallel, the exactitude of which they were intelligent enough to disown. It is obvious from what follows that Hdt. approves of the action of the Athenians, but was not going to throw away so delightful a story on mere critical grounds.

§ δ l. 56. Van H. reads παραθήκης. Cp. l. 9 *supra*.

87. 2. **οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται πρὶν κτλ.** The position and method of narrating the events next recorded seem to show that Hdt., so far as he clearly conceived the dates at all, placed all the events narrated cc. 87-93 (with certain obvious exceptions in cc. 90, 91) previous to the battle of Marathon. But this conception is almost certainly a tissue of anachronisms. It has been indicated above that the death of Kleomenes is the point of departure, and that Kleomenes died after Marathon (cp. c. 85 *supra*). Considerable displacements have occurred apparently in the chronology of the wars between Athens and Aigina, on which see Appendix VIII.

3. **Θηβαίοισι χαριζόμενοι,** 5. 81

χαριζόμενοι, ἐποίησαν τοιόνδε. μεμφόμενοι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι καὶ
ἀξιοῦντες ἀδικέεσθαι, ὡς τιμωρησόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους παρ-
εσκευάζοντο· καὶ ἦν γὰρ δὴ τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι πεντετηρὶς ἐπὶ
Σουνίῳ, λοχήσαντες [ὧν] τὴν θεωρίδα νέα εἷλον πλήρεα ἀνδρῶν
88 *τῶν πρώτων Ἀθηναίων, λαβόντες δὲ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἔδησαν. Ἀθη-*
ναῖοι δὲ παθόντες ταῦτα πρὸς Αἰγινητέων οὐκέτι ἀνεβάλλοντο μὴ
οὐ τὸ πᾶν μηχανήσασθαι ἐπ' Αἰγινήτῃσι. καὶ ἦν γὰρ Νικόδρομος
Κνοίθου καλεόμενος ἐν τῇ Αἰγίνῃ ἀνὴρ δόκιμος, οὗτος μεμφόμενος
μὲν τοῖσι Αἰγινήτῃσι προτέρην ἑωυτοῦ ἐξέλασιν ἐκ τῆς νήσου,
μαθὼν δὲ τότε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀναρτημένους ἔρδειν Αἰγινήτας
κακῶς, συντίθεται Ἀθηναίοισι προδοσίην Αἰγίνης, φράσας ἐν τῇ
τε ἡμέρῃ ἐπιχειρήσει καὶ ἐκείνους ἐς τὴν ἥκειν δεήσει βοηθέοντας.
89 *μετὰ ταῦτα καταλαμβάνει μὲν κατὰ τὰ συνεθήκατο Ἀθηναίοισι*
ὁ Νικόδρομος τὴν παλαιὴν καλεομένην πόλιν, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὐ
παραγίνονται ἐς δέον· οὐ γὰρ ἔτυχον ἐοῦσαι νέες σφι ἀξιόμαχοι

---

supra, *c.* 506 B.C. The terms here employed seem to put the Aiginetans wholly in the wrong. The story is probably of Attic origin.

5. **ἀδικέεσθαι.** The implicit assumption here is certainly that the *ἀδικία*, of which the Aiginetans complain, is the refusal of the Athenians to restore the hostages. It would be a wonder that, if these hostages were in Athens, the Athenians did not exchange them for their own leading citizens captured in the Theoris. They probably did. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 5.

6. **πεντετηρίς.** The MSS. have *πεντήρης*. Schömann's emendation is confirmed by R. Van Herwerden corrects to *πενταετηρίς*. There was a temple of Athene on Sunion (Pausan. 1. 1 *ad init.*) and there may have been a quadrennial festival held there (*νενίκηκα δὲ τριήρει μὲν ἁμιλλώμενος ἐπὶ Σουνίῳ*, Lysias, 21. 5). That the Athenians had a quinquereme at this date is incredible. The first quinquereme was not built at Athens until after the date of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*. Cp. *op. cit.* ed. Sandys, c. 46, p. 169 n. **ὧν** *secl.* Stein.

88. 2. **οὐκέτι ἀνεβάλλοντο**, 5. 49. The wording here looks like an unconscious reference to the oracle there, and serves to bring the oracle down. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 3.

μὴ οὐ. Cp. Madvig, *Gk. Syntax*, § 211 *a*, Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 95, 2. *τὸ μὴ οὐ μηχ.* would have been good Greek (cp. 5. 62 *supra πᾶν μηχανώμενοι*), but the article here must be taken with *πᾶν*. Cp. 5. 49 *supra*, *ἀναβάλλομαι ὑποκρινέεσθαι*.

5. **ἐξέλασιν.** Wherefore was Nikodromos exiled? Had he too aimed at tyranny? The road thereto might lead through demagogy and 'Atticism.' His second offence, if not his first, was 'popular,' cp. c. 91 *infra*. One could wish to have light on the relation of his policy to the treatment of the Attic prisoners, who had, however, been exchanged long before. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 5.

7. **ἐν τῇ τε . . καὶ . . ἐς τήν.** Stein regards these words as referring to two different days. It is more likely that Hdt.'s grammar is clumsy than that the conspiracy was so much disjointed. You may name the day for a *coup d'état*, but how can you say how long you will hold out afterwards? The Athenians were surely to be on the spot the very day of the democratic *émeute*. Such miscarriages are not uncommon. Cp. Thucyd. 4. 89 for a celebrated instance.

89. 3. **οὐ γὰρ ἔτυχον κτλ.** This is an astounding statement, unless it is to be supposed that Athenian vessels were absent on foreign service just at the time when they were needed to assist Nikodromos. The only foreign services which could come into the reckoning, on any hypothesis, would be (1) the expedition to Ionia in 498 B.C. See 5. 97, 99. (2) The expedition to Paros, *c.* 489 B.C., cc. 132 ff. *infra*. The latter

τῆσι Αἰγινητέων συμβαλεῖν. ἐν ᾧ ὦν Κορινθίων ἐδέοντο χρῆσαί σφισι νέας ἐν τούτῳ διεφθάρη τὰ πρήγματα. οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι, ἦσαν γάρ σφι τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον φίλοι ἐς τὰ μάλιστα, Ἀθηναίοισι διδοῦσι δεομένοισι εἴκοσι νέας, διδοῦσι δὲ πενταδράχμους ἀποδόμενοι· δωρεὴν γὰρ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ οὐκ ἐξῆν δοῦναι. ταύτας τε δὴ λαβόντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τὰς σφετέρας, πληρώσαντες ἑβδομήκοντα νέας τὰς ἁπάσας, ἔπλεον ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴγιναν καὶ ὑστέρησαν
ἡμέρῃ μιῇ τῆς συγκειμένης. Νικόδρομος δέ, ὡς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς 90
τὸν καιρὸν οὐ παρεγίνοντο, ἐς πλοῖον ἐσβὰς ἐκδιδρήσκει ἐκ τῆς Αἰγίνης· σὺν δέ οἱ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν Αἰγινητέων εἵποντο, τοῖσι Ἀθηναῖοι Σούνιον οἰκῆσαι ἔδοσαν. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ οὗτοι ὁρμώμενοι ἔφερόν τε καὶ ἦγον τοὺς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Αἰγινήτας. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ
ὕστερον ἐγίνετο. Αἰγινητέων δὲ οἱ παχέες ἐπαναστάντος τοῦ 91

---

case may be ruled out at once, for (1) Miltiades took seventy ships to Paros, (2) it is scarcely credible that the Corinthian gift to Athens was after Marathon. In regard to the earlier case, the argument is not so clear. The Aiginetans may very well have taken advantage of the absence of twenty Athenian ships in Ionia, and the Corinthians may have replaced the absent ships by an equivalent: but if so, the occasion was not the *coup d'état* of Nikodromos, unless we are prepared to take that event completely out of its connexion and sequence here. It is possible of course that the anachronisms in the text reach that extent, and that the support given to Nikodromos had nothing to say to the seizure of the Athenian *primores*. In this case the conspiracy of Nikodromos would fall between 498-491 B.C. The seizure of the Theoris, and the exchange of hostages, would fall after Marathon. That hypothesis conflicts with the date indicated for the settlement of the Aiginetan exiles at Sunion, c. 90 *infra*. In fine, the Corinthian ships were probably lent to Athens before Marathon (*circ.* 498 B.C.) and are here erroneously put into connexion with the democratic *coup d'état* at Aigina. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 5.

6. **τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον**. In 480 B.C. the Athenians and Corinthians are at loggerheads (8. 61). The goodwill of the Corinthians did not long survive the self-aggrandizement of Athens under Miltiades and Themistokles. As Miltiades took seventy ships to Paros (c. 132 *infra*) the Corinthian gift must be dated before Marathon, at a time when the interest of Corinth lay in supporting Athens against Aigina (cp. 5. 75, 92 *supra*). The emphasis on the words here shows that there is a contrast in the attitude of Corinth to Athens at the time of writing. The Corinthian orator in Thucyd. 1. 41 (433 B.C.) is represented as taking credit for this gift; it was therefore an accepted fact at Athens, but Thucydides does not date it (*ὑπὲρ τὰ Μηδικὰ* is (1) vague, (2) a gloss).

7. **πενταδράχμους**, a merely nominal price (5 francs *apiece*, cp. *δίμνεως* 5. 77, and c. 79 *supra*). The law is a curious one, designed to protect Corinthian commerce, or, perhaps, to keep some secrets of Corinthian ship-building dark. So the Romans, before the second Punic war, had no notion how to construct a quinquereme: but a stranded Carthaginian vessel served them as a model (Polyb. 1. 20, 10-16, but cp. 1. 59, 8). The Corinthian law can hardly be supposed to have been quite so simple as Hdt. implies: but evidently there was some prohibition, which was evaded by a technical conformity, or legal fiction.

90. 2. **ἐκδιδρήσκει**, presumably making his way to Attica. One boat (πλοῖον) would not hold very many: possibly more than one boat-load was brought off.

3. **τοῖσι κτλ.** Cp. Thuc. 2. 27 *ἐκπεσοῦσι δὲ τοῖς Αἰγινήταις οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἔδοσαν Θυρέαν οἰκεῖν καὶ τὴν γῆν νέμεσθαι.*

5. **ἔφερόν τε καὶ ἦγον**, c. 42 *supra*.

6. **ὕστερον**, 'after'—how long? The

δήμου σφι ἅμα Νικοδρόμῳ ἐπεκράτησαν, καὶ ἔπειτά σφεας χειρωσάμενοι ἐξῆγον ἀπολέοντες. ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ καὶ ἄγος σφι ἐγένετο, τὸ ἐκθύσασθαι οὐκ οἷοί τε ἐγένοντο ἐπιμηχανώμενοι, ἀλλ' ἔφθησαν ἐκπεσόντες πρότερον ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἤ σφι ἵλεον γενέσθαι τὴν θεόν. ἑπτακοσίους γὰρ δὴ τοῦ δήμου ζωγρήσαντες ἐξῆγον ὡς ἀπολέοντες, εἷς δέ τις τούτων ἐκφυγὼν τὰ δεσμὰ καταφεύγει πρὸς πρόθυρα Δήμητρος θεσμοφόρου, ἐπιλαμβανόμενος δὲ τῶν ἐπισπαστήρων εἴχετο· οἱ δὲ ἐπείτε μιν ἀποσπάσαι οὐκ οἷοί τε ἀπέλκοντες ἐγίνοντο, ἀποκόψαντες αὐτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας ἦγον οὕτω, αἱ χεῖρες δὲ ἐκεῖναι ἐμπεφυκυῖαι ἦσαν τοῖσι ἐπισπάστροισι.

92 *Ταῦτα μέν νυν σφέας αὐτοὺς οἱ Αἰγινῆται ἐργάσαντο, Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ ἥκουσι ἐναυμάχησαν νηυσὶ ἑβδομήκοντα, ἑσσωθέντες δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίῃ ἐπεκαλέοντο τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ πρότερον, Ἀργείους. καὶ δή σφι οὗτοι μὲν οὐκέτι βοηθέουσι, μεμφόμενοι ὅτι Αἰγιναῖαι νέες ἀνάγκῃ λαμφθεῖσαι ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος, ἔσχον τε ἐς τὴν Ἀργολίδα χώρην καὶ συναπέβησαν Λακεδαιμονίοισι, συναπέβησαν δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ Σικυωνιέων νεῶν ἄνδρες τῇ αὐτῇ ταύτῃ*

---

remark would hardly have been made if some considerable time had not been thought of between the escape of Nikodromos and the settlement at Sunion. The one occurred before, the other perhaps after, the battle of Marathon, in the conception of Herodotus. But he perhaps misconceives the chronological sequence of events, see Appendix VIII. § 5.

91. 1. **παχέες**, men of substance, 5. 30, 77, some of them, perhaps, returned hostages.

ἐπαναστάντος. The remark proves the presence of a democratic movement in Aigina under Athenian auspices. Herodotus appears to date the movement before Marathon, but it is difficult to reconcile such a conception with probability: see Appendix VIII. § 5.

5. **ἔφθησαν ἐκπεσόντες**. This certainly appears to be a reference to the expulsion of the Aiginetans from their island by the Athenians in the first summer of the 'Peloponnesian' war, B.C. 431, Thuc. 2. 27. As such it is among the latest allusions in the work of Hdt. How long after it occurred Hdt. wrote this passage does not appear, but it is obvious that Hdt. was not acquainted with the subsequent fate of the exiles in 424 B.C., Thuc. 4. 57. The whole chapter might be an insertion (*παρενθήκη* 7. 171, or *προσθήκη* 4. 30), and perhaps much more than the single chapter. At the time of the expulsion excuses may have been wanting against the Aiginetans, and this old story raked up. The *ἄγος* charges were much in evidence at the time, cp. Thuc. 1. 126, 128: but if this story had been in circulation before the outbreak of the war would not Thucydides have noticed it?

8. **θεσμοφόρου**, cc. 16 *supra*, 134 *infra*.

92. 2. **νηυσὶ ἑβδομήκοντα**. Had the Aiginetans too just seventy ships? In 480 B.C. they sent only eighteen to Artemision (8. 1) and thirty to Salamis (8. 46) though they had some others, *ib.* The seventy ships here look like the Athenian fleet, carelessly displaced. Cp. c. 89 *supra*.

ἑσσωθέντες. This naval victory of the Athenians over the Aiginetans seems to be dated by Hdt. before Marathon, and indeed the very same year: an inconsequent and incredible arrangement. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 5. In any case the Argives would hardly have been in a position to give much assistance, even without a grievance against Aigina. Cp. c. 78 *supra*.

7. **Σικυωνιέων**. Sikyon had an old grudge against Argos, 5. 67 ff. All the more surprising is it to find Sikyon paying the fine, even heavily dis-

ἐσβολῇ· καί σφι ὑπ' Ἀργείων ἐπεβλήθη ζημίη χίλια τάλαντα ἐκτῖσαι, πεντακόσια ἑκατέρους. Σικυώνιοι μέν νυν συγγνόντες ἀδικῆσαι ὡμολόγησαν ἑκατὸν τάλαντα ἐκτίσαντες ἀζήμιοι εἶναι, Αἰγινῆται δὲ οὔτε συνεγινώσκοντο ἦσάν τε αὐθαδέστεροι. διὰ δὴ ὦν σφι ταῦτα δεομένοισι ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ δημοσίου οὐδεὶς Ἀργείων ἔτι ἐβοήθεε, ἐθελονταὶ δὲ ἐς χιλίους· ἦγε δὲ αὐτοὺς στρατηγὸς [ἀνὴρ ᾧ οὔνομα] Εὐρυβάτης, <ἀνὴρ> πεντάεθλον ἐπασκήσας. τούτων οἱ πλεῦνες οὐκ ἀπενόστησαν ὀπίσω, ἀλλ' ἐτελεύτησαν ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἐν Αἰγίνῃ· αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς Εὐρυβάτης μουνομαχίην ἐπασκέων τρεῖς μὲν ἄνδρας τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ κτείνει, ὑπὸ
δὲ τοῦ τετάρτου Σωφάνεος τοῦ Δεκελέος ἀποθνήσκει. Αἰγινῆται 93
δὲ ἐοῦσι ἀτάκτοισι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι συμβαλόντες τῇσι νηυσὶ ἐνίκησαν, καί σφεων νέας τέσσερας αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἀνδράσι εἷλον.

Ἀθηναίοισι μὲν δὴ πόλεμος συνῆπτο πρὸς Αἰγινήτας. ὁ δὲ 94
Πέρσης τὸ ἑωυτοῦ ἐποίεε, ὥστε ἀναμιμνήσκοντός τε αἰεὶ τοῦ

---

counted. Hdt. does not say how long it was owing.

13. **χιλίους**, perhaps a round number, but a significant one at Argos. Cp. Thuc. 5. 67, 72. That a thousand Argives were prepared to volunteer for this service seems to show that the loss in the war with Kleomenes was exaggerated, c. 83 *supra*. True, the Argive muster-roll had been recruited by the admission of the 'slaves' to the franchise, *ibid.* Yet it was hardly these new citizens who volunteered their services to the Dorian oligarchs in Aigina for the war against Athens, nor was their general, Eurybates, of servile antecedents. The record plainly supports the hypothesis that these events are ante-dated.

14. The words bracketed are omitted in PR. Stein inserts the ἀνήρ.

18. **Σωφάνεος τοῦ Δεκελέος**. This achievement of Sophanes is referred to in connexion with others, 9. 75, where the deeds and death of the Dekeleian are more fully set forth.

93. 3. **ἐνίκησαν**. This victory of the Aiginetans over the Athenians follows two defeats, one by sea and one on land (c. 72 *supra*), and if the reconstruction attempted in Appendix VIII. be correct, the Athenian disaster, here recorded, may have been the occasion for the psephism of Themistokles, 484-3 B.C. Cp. Ἀθην. πολ. c. 22; 7. 144.

τοῖσι, omitted by Holder and van Herwerden, following β= PR.

94. 1. **συνῆπτο**. For the tense cp. 5. 78. That war was in progress between Athens and Aigina in 491-0 B.C. is, as already shown, the reverse of probable. The narrative in this chapter joins on to the narrative in c. 73 *supra*, not indeed in the intention of the author, but by the necessities of the case. The earlier stages of the great ἔχθρη (7. 145) had indeed been accomplished (5. 82 *supra*), and there was warfare between 498-491 B.C., but the extradition of the hostages reduced Aigina to quiescence, probably till after Marathon and Paros. Cp. c. 87 *supra*, and Appendix VIII. § 5.

2. **ἀναμιμνήσκοντος . . μεμνῆσθαι**. The expression is clumsy; van Herwerden brackets μεμνῆσθαί μιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων. This memorialising has been going on for eight years, see 5. 105 *supra*. Yet according to 7. 133, Dareios had just sent (c. 48 *supra*) heralds to Athens to demand earth and water, and his messengers have been cast into the *Barathron*: an outrage which here contributes nothing to his resentment: presumably either because Hdt. when writing this passage knew nothing of the said outrage, or had already related it, or blindly followed a source in which it was not recorded. The alternative would be to suppose that he deliberately suppressed it. On any supposition a *crux* remains. The Athenians are here even contrasted with the Hellenes who had refused earth and water.

θεράποντος μεμνῆσθαί μιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ Πεισιστρατιδέων προσκατημένων καὶ διαβαλλόντων Ἀθηναίους, ἅμα δὲ βουλόμενος ὁ Δαρεῖος ταύτης ἐχόμενος τῆς προφάσιος καταστρέφεσθαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοὺς μὴ δόντας αὐτῷ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. Μαρδόνιον μὲν δὴ φλαύρως πρήξαντα τῷ στόλῳ παραλύει τῆς στρατηγίης, ἄλλους δὲ στρατηγοὺς ἀποδέξας ἀπέστειλε ἐπί τε Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας, Δᾶτίν τε ἐόντα Μῆδον γένος καὶ Ἀρταφρένεα τὸν Ἀρταφρένεος παῖδα, ἀδελφιδέον <δὲ> ἑωυτοῦ· ἐντειλάμενος δὲ ἀπέπεμπε ἐξανδραποδίσαντας Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἐρέτριαν ἀνάγειν ἑωυτῷ ἐς ὄψιν

95 τὰ ἀνδράποδα. ὡς δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ οὗτοι οἱ ἀποδεχθέντες πορευόμενοι παρὰ βασιλέος ἀπίκοντο τῆς Κιλικίης ἐς τὸ Ἀλήιον πεδίον, ἅμα ἀγόμενοι πεζὸν στρατὸν πολλόν τε καὶ εὖ ἐσκευασμένον, ἐνθαῦτα στρατοπεδευομένοισι ἐπῆλθε μὲν ὁ ναυτικὸς πᾶς στρατὸς ὁ ἐπιταχθεὶς ἑκάστοισι, παρεγένοντο δὲ καὶ αἱ ἱππαγωγοὶ νέες, τὰς τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτεϊ προεῖπε τοῖσι ἑωυτοῦ δασμοφόροισι Δαρεῖος ἑτοιμάζειν. ἐσβαλόμενοι δὲ τοὺς ἵππους ἐς ταύτας καὶ τὸν πεζὸν στρατὸν ἐσβιβάσαντες ἐς τὰς νέας, ἔπλεον ἑξακοσίῃσι τριήρεσι ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἤπειρον εἶχον τὰς νέας ἰθὺ τοῦ τε Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ τῆς Θρηίκης, ἀλλ' ἐκ

3. **Πεισιστρατιδέων.** This is the first mention of the Peisistratidae actually at Susa: the date of their appearance there is not given. Ten years before Hippias had been working in the same way (διαβάλλων) at Sardes, 5. 96 *supra*.

7. **φλαύρως πρήξαντα,** *re male gesta*, an exaggeration, and even misconception, cp. c. 45 *supra*. Whatever the reasons for relieving Mardonios of the command, his failure was not one of them. Perhaps he had been quite successful enough for the king's pleasure. An absolute Monarchy cannot afford, any more than an Oligarchy, 'an only General.'

9. **Μῆδον.** That the commander-in-chief in this expedition was a Mede, as were Mazares and Harpagos, who had effected the conquest of Ionia for Kyros, 1. 157 ff., may help to account for the common Greek practice of speaking of the great struggle as the 'Median' affair, and their adversary as 'the Mede.' The Ionians associated their first reduction, the Athenians their first invasion, with a Mede.

10. **<δὲ>** Stein suggests, van Herwerden approves.

ἐντειλάμενος. Was Athens to share the same fate as Eretria? How would that have suited Hippias, whose object was to rule Athens as a Persian dependency? (5. 96 *supra*).

95. 2. **τὸ Ἀλήιον πεδίον.** Homer (if the passage be genuine—*Il.* 6. 200 ff.) in a punning humour sets Bellerophon roaming over the Aleian (Roman) plain. Strabo, 555, notices that the poet does not localise it, and elsewhere (676) himself describes its position, though its historical associations do not carry him back beyond Alexander and Philotas. "Inland from Mallos is the famous Aleian plain" (Ramsay, *Asia Minor*, 385), watered by the Pyramos, which, however, has considerably changed its course since of old.

3. **πολλὸν . . πᾶς.** The only figure given by Hdt. is 600 for the fleet. This number has already done duty for the barbarian fleet at Lade, c. 9 *supra*. Just doubled it gives the number of the fleet of Xerxes, 7. 89, minus seven. (The origin of that number may, however, be different, cp. Aischyl. *Persae*, 341 ff.)

6. **τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτεϊ,** c. 48 *supra*. The spring of 491 B.C. is referred to.

10. **ἰθὺ τοῦ τε Ἑ. κ. τῆς Θ.** The route of Mardonios two years before,

Σάμου ὁρμώμενοι παρά τε Ἰκάριον καὶ διὰ νήσων τὸν πλόον ἐποιεῦντο, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, δείσαντες μάλιστα τὸν περίπλοον τοῦ Ἄθω, ὅτι τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτεϊ ποιεύμενοι ταύτῃ τὴν κομιδὴν μεγάλως προσέπταισαν· πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἡ Νάξος σφέας ἠνάγκαζε πρότερον οὐκ ἁλοῦσα. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰκαρίου πελάγεος προσφερόμενοι 96 προσέμιξαν τῇ Νάξῳ, ἐπὶ ταύτην γὰρ δὴ πρώτην ἐπεῖχον στρατεύεσθαι οἱ Πέρσαι μεμνημένοι τῶν πρότερον . . . . οἱ Νάξιοι πρὸς τὰ ὄρεα οἴχοντο φεύγοντες οὐδὲ ὑπέμειναν. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ἀνδραποδισάμενοι τοὺς κατέλαβον αὐτῶν, ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὰ ἱρὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας νήσους ἀνήγοντο.

Ἐν ᾧ δὲ οὗτοι ταῦτα ἐποίευν, οἱ Δήλιοι ἐκλιπόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ 97 τὴν Δῆλον οἴχοντο φεύγοντες ἐς Τῆνον. τῆς δὲ στρατιῆς καταπλεούσης ὁ Δᾶτις προπλώσας οὐκ ἔα τὰς νέας πρὸς τὴν Δῆλον προσορμίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πέρην ἐν τῇ Ῥηναίῃ· αὐτὸς δὲ πυθόμενος ἵνα ἦσαν οἱ Δήλιοι, πέμπων κήρυκα ἠγόρευέ σφι τάδε. "ἄνδρες

---

c. 43 *supra*, and of the fleet of Xerxes in 480 B.C. (acting perhaps under inspiration of Mardonios). The 'short sea' route of Datis and Artaphrenes made it convenient to embark the fighting men in Kilikia, whereas in 493 B.C. the army had marched to the Hellespont. It may be doubted whether the Persians in 490 B.C. had any large number of fighting ships with them, as distinguished from transports.

ἐκ Σάμου, under Aiakes, c. 25 *supra*, and devoted to the Persian interest. Hippias may have been cheered by the prognostic to be drawn from the case of the Samian tyrant.

11. **Ἰκάριον**, *sc.* πέλαγος as in c. 96 *infra*.

νήσων, *sc.* τῶν Κυκλάδων as in 5. 30, 31.

The short sea-route was commended not merely by these considerations, but by the need for rapidity, the easier commissariat, the presence of Hippias, and the 'objective' of the force.

13. **τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτεϊ** must be regarded as a *lapsus calami*, as the storm off Athos took place in the summer of 492 B.C., c. 44 *supra*. Dobree suggested *τῷ τρίτῳ πρότερον*, but the supposition of a slip on Hdt.'s part is not unreasonable. The codices show no corruption, but the words occur eight lines above.

96. 3. **τῶν πρότερον.** Stein marks a lacuna, and suggests *ἔπαθον ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐνθαῦτα* to fill it; van Herwerden preserves the text as it stands, and puts a comma after Πέρσαι, taking the participle to agree with οἱ Νάξιοι. The Persian motive for making for Naxos has already been stated. The two amendments are not mutually exclusive. Van Herwerden has spared οἱ Πέρσαι, but it is a question whether it should not go out. The reference is of course to the expedition of Aristagoras and Megabates, some ten years before, 5. 30 ff. In visiting Naxos before Delos the Mede steered S.S.W. Rheneia and Delos are due north of Paros, which is due west of Naxos.

6. **τὰς ἄλλας νήσους.** C. 49 *supra* Hdt. has stated that all the islanders from whom earth and water were demanded surrendered to the king, summer of 491 B.C., including Aigina. Naxos may have been omitted, but hardly Paros, and some of the more important Kyklades. But Datis (guided by Hippias) may have visited the other islands to levy supplies, hostages, and contingents. Cp. c. 99 *infra*.

97. 1. **ἐν ᾧ.** The men of Delos might have sighted the armada on its way south to Naxos. They retreated north to Tenos.

5. **τάδε.** Was the pious respect of Datis for Delos quite independent of the influence of Hippias? The resurrection of Delos had been one of

ἰροί, τί φεύγοντες οἴχεσθε, οὐκ ἐπιτήδεα καταγνόντες κατ' ἐμεῦ;
ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτό γε φρονέω καί μοι ἐκ βασιλέος
ὧδε ἐπέσταλται, ἐν τῇ χώρῃ οἱ δύο θεοὶ ἐγένοντο, ταύτην μηδὲν
σίνεσθαι, μήτε αὐτὴν τὴν χώρην μήτε τοὺς οἰκήτορας αὐτῆς. νῦν
ὦν καὶ ἄπιτε ἐπὶ τὰ ὑμέτερα αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν νῆσον νέμεσθε."
ταῦτα μὲν ἐπεκηρυκεύσατο τοῖσι Δηλίοισι, μετὰ δὲ λιβανωτοῦ
98 τριηκόσια τάλαντα κατανήσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐθυμίησε. Δᾶτις
μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ποιήσας ἔπλεε ἅμα τῷ στρατῷ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν
πρῶτα, ἅμα ἀγόμενος καὶ Ἴωνας καὶ Αἰολέας. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον

---

the ideas of Peisistratos (Thuc. 3. 104, cp. 5. 63, 69 *supra*), and Hippias, expelled from Athens by Delphi (5. 63 *supra*), and abandoned by Sparta (5. 93 *supra*), was not likely to overlook the use to be made of Delos, after his restoration. If there is any force in ἠγόρευε here, it should mean that the speech was addressed to the men of Delos assembled.

7. **ἐκ βασιλέος ὧδε ἐπέσταλται.** The policy of the Persian Empire was tolerant towards the deities of the conquered, and there is no sign of iconoclasm, or of a religious propaganda under the Achaemenids. The opposite idea arose mainly from a misinterpretation of the story of the pseudo-Smerdis in the light of the Behistun inscription (*e.g.* Rawlinson, Hdt. Appendix, Bk. iii. Essay ii. vol. ii.[3] pp. 548 ff.). Evidences more recently discovered (the Kyreian inscriptions from Babylon, inscriptions of Kambyses and Dareios himself in Egypt) have led to a more correct estimate. (Cp. Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alterth.* i. p. 608.) The treatment of Delos (and Delphi) is more significant than the destruction of Athens, in this connexion. Even in regard to Athens the anecdotes show that there was no crusade against the gods of Greece. Cp. 7. 43, 8. 54, etc.

Over and above this general policy of toleration the Asiatics would be at no loss to identify Apollo and Artemis with their own Sun and Moon divinities. The offering of Datis on the Delian altar would please all pious Ionians, and even a genuine act of devotion may have been not wholly devoid of a political purpose.

12. **τριηκόσια τάλαντα,** 300 T. *weight* of frankincense would be incredible, though that is what Hdt. seems to say, without specifying whether the talents are Attic or other: 300 T. *worth* hardly less incredible. Hultsch, *Métrologie*[2], p. 129 rationalises the statement to the effect that in the sense of the Persian [Mede?] who made the offering, the 300 'weights' of frankincense, each of which amounted to (*betrug*) a shekel [*i.e.* light Babylonian shekel], might be regarded as equivalent in worth to so many shekels of gold, *i.e.* darics. "On this hypothesis the value of the offering amounted to exactly one Talent of silver." Cp. Ridgway, *Origin of Currency*, p. 6. This may explain the origin of Hdt.'s blunder, but it does not cancel it.

98. 3. **πρῶτα.** Why the advance was made first on Eretria, why Euboea rather than the medizing Aigina was to be made the basis of operations against Attica, it is not easy to determine. Perhaps the prejudices, or even the superstitions of Hippias, were consulted, he leading the Persians not merely to Marathon (c. 102 *infra*) but to Euboea, whence he had already 'returned' once in triumph with his father, 1. 91. Perhaps the medizing party in Eretria (cc. 100, 101 *infra*) were already in communication with the Barbarians. Perhaps the advance on Euboea and the east coast was calculated to lull the alarms of the Peloponnesians and to retard their assistance; if so, the calculation was realised. The attack on Attica was made from the same side as if the Mede had advanced from Thrace and Macedon. Possibly the Aiginetans were expected to do something for the Persian, on the other side.

καὶ Ἴωνας καὶ Αἰολέας. The Dorians, as usual, conspicuous by their absence. Cp. c. 32 *supra*.

ἐνθεῦτεν ἐξαναχθέντα Δῆλος ἐκινήθη, ὡς ἔλεγον Δήλιοι, καὶ πρῶτα καὶ ὕστατα μέχρι ἐμεῦ σεισθεῖσα. καὶ τοῦτο μέν κου τέρας ἀνθρώποισι τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι κακῶν ἔφαινε ὁ θεός. ἐπὶ γὰρ Δαρείου τοῦ Ὑστάσπεος καὶ Ξέρξεω τοῦ Δαρείου καὶ

---

4. **ὡς ἔλεγον Δήλιοι.** The assertion is a double one: (1) that presently after the departure of Datis from Delos for Eretria, in the summer of 490 B.C. there was an earthquake; (2) that the said earthquake was the first and last earthquake ever felt in Delos 'down to me (my visit).' How much of this double assertion is given on the authority of the Delians is not quite clear. Did the Delians simply report the earthquake, or did they assert, further, that it was a unique experience? In either case it is natural to interpret the passage as implying a visit by Hdt. to Delos, some time before he actually wrote this passage (*ἔλεγον . . μέχρι ἐμεῦ*). It is natural further to conclude that at the time of writing Hdt. had not heard of any other *seismos* before or since his visit, or he would probably have mentioned it. This statement, however, is not inconsistent with the occurrence of an earthquake subsequently to his visit, nor even perhaps quite strictly with his having heard tell of such an occurrence; and he might even be contradicting such an assertion. Thucydides (2. 8) also reports an earthquake at Delos as occurring a little before the outbreak of war in 431 B.C., and perfectly unique in Hellenic history, and regarded, not without reason, as portentous: *Δῆλος ἐκινήθη ὀλίγον πρὸ τούτων, πρότερον οὔπω σεισθεῖσα ἀφ' οὗ Ἕλληνες μέμνηνται. ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ ἐδόκει ἐπὶ τοῖς μέλλουσι γενήσεσθαι σημῆναι.* It is obviously impossible to reconcile the statement of the Athenian with the statement of the 'Thurian' historian. Thucydides asserts of his own knowledge that a unique earthquake took place just before the Peloponnesian war. If so, the earthquake reported by Hdt. as having taken place in the summer of 490 B.C. never took place. Thucydides is obviously contradicting Hdt. It by no means follows that Thucydides is right. There may have been only one shaking of Delos. It may have occurred in 490 B.C. as reported by Hdt. Thucydides, writing or retouching the history of the Archidamian war some thirty years after its outbreak, and doing all he could to magnify its importance and depreciate the glories of the wars against the barbarian, may with greater or less excuse have shifted the earthquake some sixty years down. There may have been two earthquakes, one in 490 B.C. and really unique at the date of Hdt.'s visit to the island, or interview with the 'Delians,' and still unique, so far as he knew, when he composed and when he revised his own work: the other in 431 B.C. but not unique, as Thucydides deliberately asserts. There may have been two or more earthquakes at Delos in the course of ages, though the island had a good repute for stability:—but perhaps every earthquake in the holy isle ought to have been unique, and was therefore unique, according to the local authorities. That Hdt. is actually contradicting the report of an earthquake in 431 B.C. afterwards taken up by Thucydides is the least plausible hypothesis; still, as Hdt. reports events of that date, and later, his text here makes against the supposition that the report was true. Other possibilities are also not to be wholly excluded. There may have been an earthquake at some date unascertainable, previous to Hdt.'s visit to Delos, or to the composition of this passage, which Hdt. claims for the Median and Thucydides for the Peloponnesian war. There may have been no earthquake at Delos at all. But on the whole it seems most probable that the earthquake occurred at the date given by Hdt., or at least before the Medic war, and that later pragmatism annexed it to the Peloponnesian.

6. **τέρας . . ἔφαινε ὁ θεός.** Cp. Introduction, pp. cx ff.

7. **ἐπὶ γὰρ κτλ.** It has been argued that this passage must have been written after the death of Artaxerxes Makrocheir in 425 B.C. (cp. Thuc. 4. 50). If so, this would be the latest reference in Hdt. to contemporary events, and the end of the sentence would certainly have to be taken as including the events of the

Ἀρτοξέρξεω τοῦ Ξέρξεω, τριῶν τουτέων ἐπεξῆς γενεέων, ἐγένετο πλέω κακὰ τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἢ ἐπὶ εἴκοσι ἄλλας γενεὰς τὰς πρὸ Δαρείου γενομένας, τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν Περσέων αὐτῇ γενόμενα, τὰ δὲ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν κορυφαίων περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς πολεμεόντων. οὕτω οὐδὲν ἦν ἀεικὲς κινηθῆναι Δῆλον τὸ πρὶν ἐοῦσαν ἀκίνητον. [καὶ ἐν χρησμῷ ἦν γεγραμμένον περὶ αὐτῆς ὧδε·

κινήσω καὶ Δῆλον ἀκίνητόν περ ἐοῦσαν.]

δύναται δὲ κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ταῦτα τὰ οὐνόματα, Δαρεῖος ἐρξείης, Ξέρξης ἀρήιος, Ἀρτοξέρξης μέγας ἀρήιος. τούτους μὲν δὴ τοὺς βασιλέας ὧδε ἂν ὀρθῶς κατὰ γλῶσσαν τὴν σφετέρην Ἕλληνες καλέοιεν.

99 *Οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ὡς ἀπήειραν ἐκ τῆς Δήλου, προσῖσχον πρὸς*

---

war in Greece 431-425 B.C. But the argument is inconclusive. If it were said: 'During the reigns of George, William, and Victoria, England has made greater progress than during the twenty reigns previous'; such a remark would not imply that the present Queen's reign was over (*ὃ μὴ γένοιτο*). Artaxerxes I. reigned for upwards of a generation, coming to the throne probably about 464 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 293). Hdt. might have written as he does here many years before the king was gathered to his fathers. The identification of reigns and generations should not be pressed in favour of the latest possible date, for it proves too much. Three generations with Hdt. make a hundred years (2. 142), but the three reigns here referred to, even if regarded as complete, fall short of the century (521-425). The identification of reigns and generations only shows how loose the chronological reference is. There is thus no necessity to conclude that this passage was written after 431 B.C.

9. **εἴκοσι ἄλλας γενεάς.** Twenty generations = 666⅔ years. If these be added to the date of the *accession* of Dareios (521 B.C.) they bring us to 1188 B.C.; if to the date of the birth of Dareios (551 B.C.) they bring us to 1218 B.C., in either case within measurable distance of the Trojan war, the aera of which according to Hdt. is about 1250 B.C. (2. 145). Hdt. may be taken to say that since the days of Agamemnon Hellas had never had such cause of woe as 'the last hundred years or so.' It is strange to find Kyros omitted, to say nothing of the wars with the Mermnadae. The *generation* as distinguished from the *reign* of Dareios would take us back nearly to the accession of Kroisos (Herodotus' aera in Bk. 1), but the passage before us here is not scientific but rhetorical chronology, and it is labour lost to attempt to harmonise it with Hdt.'s other data.

11. **αὐτῶν τῶν κορυφαίων περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς πολεμεόντων.** These words would apply to the circumstances of Hellas in 431 B.C. and following years, but they would have been justified by the events which followed the first rupture with Sparta (*c.* 461-451 B.C.), and at any rate must be taken to refer to them.

12. **οὐδὲν ἦν ἀεικές.** On ideal principles it would perhaps have been still more proper for this portent to have occurred two years or so earlier, before the Ionian revolt, before the affair of Naxos, if not, indeed, on the first appearance of Kyros in Western Asia in 546 B.C.

καὶ . . ἐοῦσαν. These words are omitted in some of the best MSS. ABC (= *a*).

15. **δύναται.** These etymological efforts are all unsuccessful, except perhaps that *arta* is an intensive particle. The modern etymologists, however, only agree in differing from Herodotus: see the valuable List of Proper Names in Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, vol. iii.[3] pp. 539 ff. Van Herwerden follows Wesseling in regarding the passage as spurious, and removes it from the text.

99. 1. **οἱ δὲ β.** answers *τοῦτο μέν*, c. 98 *supra*.

πρὸς τὰς νήσους comes in here

τὰς νήσους, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ στρατιήν τε παρελάμβανον καὶ ὁμήρους
τῶν νησιωτέων παῖδας ἐλάμβανον. ὡς δὲ περιπλέοντες τὰς
νήσους προσέσχον καὶ ἐς Κάρυστον, οὐ γὰρ δή σφι οἱ Καρύστιοι
οὔτε ὁμήρους ἐδίδοσαν οὔτε ἔφασαν ἐπὶ πόλιας ἀστυγείτονας
στρατεύεσθαι, λέγοντες Ἐρέτριάν τε καὶ Ἀθήνας, ἐνθαῦτα τούτους
ἐπολιόρκεόν τε καὶ τὴν γῆν σφεων ἔκειρον, ἐς ὃ καὶ οἱ Καρύστιοι
παρέστησαν ἐς τῶν Περσέων τὴν γνώμην. Ἐρετριέες δὲ πυν- 100
θανόμενοι τὴν στρατιὴν τὴν Περσικὴν ἐπὶ σφέας ἐπιπλέουσαν
Ἀθηναίων ἐδεήθησαν σφίσι βοηθοὺς γενέσθαι. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὐκ
ἀπείπαντο τὴν ἐπικουρίην, ἀλλὰ τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους τοὺς
κληρουχέοντας τῶν ἱπποβοτέων Χαλκιδέων τὴν χώρην, τούτους
σφι διδοῦσι τιμωρούς. τῶν δὲ Ἐρετριέων ἦν ἄρα οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς

---

again (cp. c. 96 *supra*) a little clumsily after ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν πρῶτα in c. 98 *supra*. The repetition παρελάμβανον and ἐλάμβανον is also somewhat awkward. But Hdt. must sometimes be allowed to nod.

3. **περιπλέοντες.** A certain amount of time seems to have been consumed in this Periplus of the Kyklades. The first real resistance is experienced at Karystos in Euboea. The old Peisistratid connexion with the Kyklades may have counted for something in these delays. The conduct of the Karystians is in strong contrast to that of the Ionians and Aeolians, who served with the Persian fleet: but they too are reduced and 'medize.' Cp. 8. 66, 112. Their subjection to Athens (9. 105) would be at least partially justified thereby (cp. Thuc. 1. 98, and for the principle, Thuc. 6. 82, 83).

5. **ἀστυγείτονας.** The Karystians were accounted *Dryopes*, not Ionians (Thuc. 7. 57, 4), hence perhaps the choice of the term.

100. 3. **Ἀθηναίων.** The application of the Eretrians was presumably brought before the *Ekklesia*. According to the story given in this chapter the Eretrians had only themselves to thank for their subsequent fate. Eretria was divided against itself. The Athenians, indeed, evacuated Euboea, and left it to its fate, but only at the express entreaty of a leading and loyal citizen of Eretria. Strangely enough, neither he nor his partisans, though foreseeing the inevitable, accompanied the Athenians in their retreat. The apologetic tendency of this story is patent. To have detached or left these 4000 hoplites, who doubtless fought in their own *Phylae* at Marathon, for the support or defence of Eretria, would have been, at the time, an heroic counsel. Afterwards, it may have seemed as though more of a stand might have been made at Eretria. But this story supplies the *raison suffisante* for the withdrawal. Divided counsels, positive treachery, express and pressing authority fully justified the action. The complete omission of all notice of the advantage to Athens of these 4000 soldiers in Attica makes the story the more to be suspected (cp. Wecklein, *Tradition der Perserkriege*, p. 39). Perhaps the Athenians were justified politically and strategically in confining their own action to Attica, and the message to Sparta, c. 106 *infra*, betrays no bad conscience, but rather a hint that Sparta, if any one, was to blame for the loss of Eretria. From the Euboean point of view, would there have been much to choose between Sparta's treatment of Athens, and the Athenian treatment of Eretria!

4. **τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους**: cp. 5. 77.

6. **οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς βούλευμα.** βούλευμα *del.* Cobet. Eretria was of old favourable to the Peisistratids (1. 62 and c. 98 *supra*). But the part taken in the Ionian revolt, 5. 99, and the obstinate defence of the city on this occasion, seem to show that Eretria by this time was for freedom. The story here rather implies that there was but one true man in a rotten state. A passage in Xenophon, *Hell.* 3. 1, 6, suggests that the medizing party was at this time non-existent. The king had counted a single partisan, one Gongylos, in Eretria, but he was in exile, and

βούλευμα, οἳ μετεπέμποντο μὲν Ἀθηναίους, ἐφρόνεον δὲ διφασίας ἰδέας. οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐβουλεύοντο ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν ἐς τὰ ἄκρα τῆς Εὐβοίης, ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτῶν ἴδια κέρδεα προσδεκόμενοι παρὰ τοῦ Πέρσεω οἴσεσθαι προδοσίην ἐσκευάζοντο. μαθὼν δὲ τούτων ἑκάτερα ὡς εἶχε Αἰσχίνης ὁ Νόθωνος, ἐὼν τῶν Ἐρετριέων τὰ πρῶτα, φράζει τοῖσι ἥκουσι Ἀθηναίων πάντα τὰ παρεόντα σφι πρήγματα, προσεδέετό τε ἀπαλλάσσεσθαί σφεας ἐς τὴν σφετέρην, ἵνα μὴ προσαπόλωνται. οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι ταῦτα Αἰσχίνῃ

101 συμβουλεύσαντι πείθονται. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν διαβάντες ἐς Ὠρωπὸν ἔσωζον σφέας αὐτούς· οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι πλέοντες κατέσχον τὰς νέας τῆς Ἐρετρικῆς χώρης κατὰ Τέμενος καὶ Χοιρέας καὶ Αἰγίλεα, κατασχόντες δὲ ταῦτα τὰ χωρία αὐτίκα ἵππους τε ἐξεβάλλοντο καὶ παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς προσοισόμενοι τοῖσι ἐχθροῖσι. οἱ δὲ Ἐρετριέες ἐπεξελθεῖν μὲν καὶ μαχέσασθαι οὐκ ἐποιεῦντο βουλήν, εἴ κως δὲ διαφυλάξαιεν τὰ τείχεα, τούτου σφι πέρι ἔμελε, ἐπείτε ἐνίκα μὴ

---

had met his reward. This Gongylos may have been to Eretria what Hippias was to Athens. But if Xenophon *l. c.* is accurate, the Gongylos there mentioned as alive in 399 B.C. cannot have medized in 490 B.C., much less previously. If Blakesley's suggestion is correct, that the Gongylos of Xenophon is grandson of the Gongylos who first medized, then Xenophon has expressed himself very inaccurately. That indeed is not unlikely. Thucydides, 1. 126, mentions a Gongylos of Eretria as an internuntius between Pausanias and the great king in 477-6 B.C. This might be the original traitor, whom Xenophon has confounded with his son or grandson. As he is not here named by Hdt. we may suppose that he had already fled to the Medes, and was perhaps now in the suite of Datis or of Hippias.

7. **διφασίας ἰδέας.** It is providential that these Eretrians are finally to be quartered in the neighbourhood of a well *τὸ παρέχεται τριφασίας ἰδέας*, c. 119 *infra*. The criticism in this chapter is unsound. There are two parties in Eretria, the party for taking to the mountains, the party for surrender and medism. (There is, indeed, a third *ἰδέα*—the one righteous man, Aischines.) The medizing party has its way, and yet the city instead of surrendering stands a siege, and that no make-believe, six days. Duncker, vii.[5] 118 n., thinks that Hdt.'s source of information was the exiled Eretrians on the Tigris. But cp. note c. 119 *infra*.

12. **τὰ πρῶτα.** Cp. 9. 77 and Kuehner, *Ausf. Gr.* § 362.

101. 1. **Ὠρωπόν**: *ἀπέχει δὲ μάλιστα ὁ Ὠρωπὸς τῆς τῶν Ἐρετριέων πόλεως θαλάσσης μέτρον ἑξήκοντα σταδίους*, Thuc. 8. 95, 3. That was the new Eretria (Strabo, 448). Oropos, the Attic port for Euboea, cp. Thuc. 7. 28, 1, beyond the natural frontier of Attica, had been annexed, perhaps, at the time of the war with the Boeotians, 5. 77 *supra*, for it was not one of the demi (cp. 5. 74 *supra*). Cp. c. 108 *infra*.

3. **Τέμενος**, so the MSS. but Valckenaer's conjecture *Ταμύνας* is to be preferred. Cp. Strabo, 448 *ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐρετρικῇ πόλις ἦν Τάμυναι πλησίον τοῦ πορθμοῦ*. The other places probably dependent villages, cp. Baehr's note.

4. **ἵππους**, the penultimate reference to the Persian cavalry, cp. c. 102 *infra*. If *ἐς ταῦτα* (PR) is not correct then *κατέσχον* and *κατασχόντες* are used in different senses.

7. **ἐνίκα μὴ ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν.** This decision might in itself explain the retreat of the Athenians: or the retreat of the Athenians might have necessitated this decision, without recourse to the hypothesis of treachery. In the case of Athens, indeed, the danger of treachery is used as an argument for risking an engagement, c. 109 *infra*. But then Athens was probably not in a position to stand a siege.

ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν. προσβολῆς δὲ γινομένης καρτερῆς πρὸς τὸ τεῖχος ἔπιπτον ἐπὶ ἓξ ἡμέρας πολλοὶ μὲν ἀμφοτέρων· τῇ δὲ ἑβδόμῃ Εὔφορβός τε ὁ Ἀλκιμάχου καὶ Φίλαγρος ὁ Κυνέου ἄνδρες τῶν ἀστῶν δόκιμοι προδιδοῦσι τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι. οἱ δὲ ἐσελθόντες ἐς τὴν πόλιν τοῦτο μὲν τὰ ἱρὰ συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν, ἀποτινύμενοι τῶν ἐν Σάρδισι κατακαυθέντων ἱρῶν, τοῦτο δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠνδραποδίσαντο κατὰ τὰς Δαρείου ἐντολάς.

Χειρωσάμενοι δὲ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν καὶ ἐπισχόντες ὀλίγας ἡμέρας 102
ἔπλεον ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικήν, κατέργοντές τε πολλὸν καὶ δοκέοντες ταὐτὰ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ποιήσειν τὰ καὶ τοὺς Ἐρετριέας ἐποίησαν. καὶ ἦν γὰρ ὁ Μαραθὼν ἐπιτηδεότατον χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς

Cp. 5. 64 *supra*. For six days resistance was maintained successfully in Eretria: then treachery handed over the city to the foe. Gongylos, who we may suppose was in the ranks of the Persians, may have acted on this occasion as go-between. The total destruction of Eretria and the captivity of the inhabitants (cp. c. 119 *infra*) might be thought to show that it was no part of the Persian policy, chiefly swayed perhaps by Hippias, to establish a local despot in Eretria: Gongylos had already received his reward, or was secure of it (Xenophon, *l. c. supra*). That the destruction of Eretria was a τίσις is probably a pragmatic exaggeration. (Cp. Introduction, p. cxv.) Eretria was restored on the old site (*pace* Strabo, *l. c. supra*), but never recovered this blow; she sent seven galleys to Salamis, 8. 46, and less than 600 hoplites to Plataia, 9. 28. For subsequent history cp. *Dict. of Geogr. sub voc.*, and on the coinage, B. Head, *Hist. Num.* pp. 305 ff. The site has been explored by the American School at Athens, and Strabo's mistake refuted. Cp. *American Journal of Archaeology*, vii. (1891) 3, 4, and especially p. 241.

12. **ἀποτινύμενοι.** Cp. 5. 102 *supra*.

14. **ἐντολάς**, c. 94 *supra*. The 'commands' are probably inferred from the results. Bursian's inference, *Geogr.* ii. 420, that the Persians fired only the temples and not the private houses is illegitimate. The private houses are to be understood, *a majori*.

102. 1. **ἐπισχόντες.** The motive for this delay we are left to conjecture; need for recuperation after the losses at Eretria, desire to intrigue in Athens, the feebleness of Hippias, some further operations (cp. c. 118 *infra*), or what not?

2. **ἐς γῆν τ. Ἀ.** (Old) Eretria was much to the north or north-west of the Tetrapolis, Oropus was the nearest Attic post (cp. c. 101 *supra*). The promontory Kynosura would have to be rounded in order to reach the bay of Marathon. Old Eretria is placed on Kiepert's map east of (new) Eretria, cp. *Dict. of Geogr. sub voc.* Bursian, *Geogr. v. Griechenl.* ii. 420, questions there having been any change of site.

κατέργοντες is a difficulty; κατείργειν is transitive, cp. 4. 49, 5. 63 *supra*. Stein has suggested taking it intransitively, in the sense *hindrängend*, that is, 'in hot haste': but they do not seem to have been in any hurry. He has also suggested an emendation: κατεπείγοντές τε τὸν πλόον. κατοργέοντες with Dietsch, or καταγνόντες with Madvig would be preferable. (But cp. L. & S.) Van Herwerden reads, by conjecture, κατηλογέοντες.

3. **ποιέειν τινά τι** is strictly Herodotean. Cp. 1. 115, 3. 75, also ποιεῖν τί τι 4. 166 *supra*.

4. **καὶ ἦν γὰρ κτλ.** Oropus was nearer Eretria, and also Rhamnos, not to mention other places. 'The plain' (cp. 1. 59), if not the Thriasian plain, was much better adapted to cavalry than the confined and marshy ground at Marathon, crossed by stream-beds and commanded by hills and highland. Hdt.'s statement makes it the more inconsequent that he should say nothing subsequently of the cavalry, and raises a doubt whether he had been over the ground. On some probable reasons for attacking Athens on this side, cp. c. 99 *supra*.

Hippias had good reason to select the Tetrapolis, cp. 1. 62. Cp. further Appendix X. § 7.

ἐνιππεῦσαι καὶ ἀγχοτάτω τῆς Ἐρετρίης, ἐς τοῦτό σφι κατηγέετο
103 Ἱππίης ὁ Πεισιστράτου. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὡς ἐπύθοντο ταῦτα, ἐβοήθεον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐς τὸν Μαραθῶνα. ἦγον δέ σφεας στρατηγοὶ δέκα, τῶν ὁ δέκατος ἦν Μιλτιάδης· τοῦ τὸν πατέρα Κίμωνα τὸν Στησαγόρεω κατέλαβε φυγεῖν ἐξ Ἀθηνέων Πεισίστρατον τὸν Ἱπποκράτεος. καὶ αὐτῷ φεύγοντι Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀνελέσθαι τεθρίππῳ συνέβη, καὶ ταύτην μὲν τὴν νίκην ἀνελόμενόν μιν τὠυτὸ ἐξενείκασθαι τῷ ὁμομητρίῳ ἀδελφεῷ Μιλτιάδῃ· μετὰ δὲ τῇ

---

103. 2. **ἐβοήθεον καὶ αὐτοί.** Would a psephism of the Ekklesia have been necessary to decide on this movement? Cp. c. 100 *supra*. Not perhaps in the days when Hdt. was writing, at least if *αὐτοκρατία* had been previously voted to the Strategi; but in 490 B.C. the case was probably different. It may, however, be said that Hdt. does not negative the possibility of a psephism on this occasion. It becomes, however, at once obvious that Hdt.'s account leaves details to be understood.

ἦγον . . στρατηγοὶ δέκα. As the Polemarch too went to Marathon (c. 109 *infra*), or rather to Probalinthos (cp. Appendix X. § 31), it appears that the city was left without any of its regular military officers. Hdt. indeed does not here use the words *οἱ δέκα στρατηγοί*, cp. c. 105 *infra*, but his main conception of the constitutional situation is anachronistic. The Polemarch was probably leading (*ἦγε*). See c. 109 *infra*.

3. **ὁ δέκατος** savours of the Thucydidean phrase *δέκατος αὐτός, πεμπτὸς αὐτὸς et sim.*, and carries with it the suggestion of a technical superiority in the Strategos named over his colleagues. Cp. Hermann, *Lehrbuch*, I. ii.[6] § 113, p. 648. That Miltiades possessed such a superiority *de facto* is the clear moral of the story of Marathon. Cp. Appendix X. § 5. It is plain, however, that the story is coloured by the later constitutional practices of the Athenian state, as well as by other interests.

Stein[4] interprets this passage to mean that Miltiades was the *last*, the order of the Strategi following the annual order of the Phylae (cp. c. 111 *infra*), which they commanded and to which they belonged. (Cp. Ἀθην. πολ. c. 22.) In this case Miltiades, according to Stein, commanded the Oineis, to which his Deme, Lakiadae, belonged, and this Phyle stood on the extreme left in the order of battle. But cp. c. 104 *infra*, and Appendix X. § 23. Among the colleagues of Miltiades were Stesilaos (c. 114 *infra*), Aristeides (Plutarch, *Arist.* 5) and possibly even Themistokles.

5. **Ὀλυμπιάδα.** The dates of the three victories are probably Ol. 61, 62, 63, or Ol. 62, 63, 64. Clinton prefers the latter (*F. H.* ii.[3] p. 232), Duncker the former, *Gesch. d. Alterth.* vi.[5] p. 469.

6. **τὠυτὸ ἐξενείκασθαι,** "gained the very same honour which had before been carried off by Miltiades" (R.). If this is what Hdt. meant to say he took an uncommonly roundabout way of saying it; and was it worth saying? Besides, there is nothing in the text to justify the "before." Some have understood *ἐξενείκασθαι* in the sense 'transferred': the victory which he won he transferred to his brother, gave the honour to his brother, cp. *παραδιδοῖ Πεισιστράτῳ ἀνακηρυχθῆναι* just below. This gives a very good sense, but only by violence done to the verb. In any case the grammar of the passage is exceptionable, but to preserve the correct sense of *ἐξενείκασθαι* one might take *ταύτην μὲν τὴν νίκην ἀνελόμενόν μιν* as an *accusativus pendens* and repeat *συνέβη* before *τῷ κτλ.* The sense of the passage would then run: *καὶ αὐτῷ φεύγοντι Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀνελέσθαι τεθρίππῳ συνέβη καὶ τῷ ὁμομητρίῳ ἀδελφεῷ τὠυτὸ ἐξενείκασθαι.* Kimon won the victory, but Miltiades had the credit of it. (With *τὠυτὸ* cp. *τοῦτο*, c. 105. l. 3 *infra*.) The 'national' law of the Olympic meeting so far recognised the 'municipal' laws of the Greek states severally as to exclude from the honours of the *ἀγών* citizens under *ἀτιμία*. This at least was the case in the fourth century. Cp. Smith, *Dict. of Antiquities*[2], 862 a. Hence Kimon *φεύγων* and *ἄτιμος* could not have himself proclaimed victor.

ὑστέρῃ Ὀλυμπιάδι τῇσι αὐτῇσι ἵπποισι νικῶν παραδιδοῖ Πεισιστράτῳ ἀνακηρυχθῆναι, καὶ τὴν νίκην παρεὶς τούτῳ κατῆλθε ἐπὶ τὰ ἑωυτοῦ ὑπόσπονδος. καί μιν ἀνελόμενον τῇσι αὐτῇσι ἵπποισι ἄλλην Ὀλυμπιάδα κατέλαβε ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν Πεισιστράτου παίδων, οὐκέτι περιεόντος αὐτοῦ Πεισιστράτου· κτείνουσι δὲ οὗτοί μιν κατὰ τὸ πρυτανήιον νυκτὸς ὑπείσαντες ἄνδρας. τέθαπται δὲ Κίμων πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος, πέρην τῆς διὰ Κοίλης καλεομένης ὁδοῦ· καταντίον δ' αὐτοῦ αἱ ἵπποι τεθάφαται αὗται αἱ τρεῖς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἀνελόμεναι. ἐποίησαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι ἵπποι ἤδη τὠυτὸ τοῦτο Εὐαγόρεω Λάκωνος, πλέω δὲ τουτέων οὐδαμαί. ὁ μὲν δὴ πρεσβύτερος τῶν παίδων τῷ Κίμωνι Στησαγόρης ἦν τηνικαῦτα παρὰ τῷ πάτρῳ Μιλτιάδῃ τρεφόμενος ἐν τῇ Χερσονήσῳ, ὁ δὲ νεώτερος παρ' αὐτῷ Κίμωνι ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι, οὔνομα ἔχων ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκιστέω τῆς Χερσονήσου Μιλτιάδεω Μιλτιάδης. οὗτος δὴ 104
ὢν τότε ὁ Μιλτιάδης ἥκων ἐκ τῆς Χερσονήσου καὶ ἐκπεφευγὼς διπλόον θάνατον ἐστρατήγεε Ἀθηναίων. ἅμα μὲν γὰρ οἱ Φοίνικες αὐτὸν οἱ ἐπιδιώξαντες μέχρι Ἴμβρου περὶ πολλοῦ ἐποιεῦντο

For a similar case cp. c. 70 *supra*, and Thuc. 5. 50, 4.

12. **οὐκέτι περιεόντος αὐτοῦ Π.** Peisistratos died in 428 B.C., Ol. 62 began at midsummer of that year. On the date and event, cp. Appendix IX. § 1.

13. **τὸ πρυτανήιον.** This term might have designated at one time or another three different buildings, on three different sides of the Akropolis: (1) The original town-hall, in Kydathenaion. (2) The Tholos, in the inner Kerameikos. (3) The new town-hall, on the north side of the Akropolis. Cp. Curtius, *Stadtg.* pp. lxxxix. 51, 93, 244, 302. If Curtius is right in ascribing (3) to Demetrios of Phaleron (*op. c.* p. 244), it may be ruled out. It is doubtful whether the Tholos was called the Prytaneion by any early or correct authority. It would therefore appear that we must here understand (1). But the site of this Theseian Prytaneion (Thuc. 2. 15, 3) is theoretical, and it is observable that Thucydides *l.c.* though fixing the position of the older temples leaves the position of the (older) town-hall undefined.

14. **πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος κτλ.** reads like autopsy. The cemetery of the Philaids was close to Athens: *πρὸς γὰρ ταῖς Μελιτίσι πύλαις καλουμέναις ἐστὶν ἐν Κοίλῃ τὰ καλούμενα Κιμώνια μνήματα* (Marcellin. *vit. Thuc.* 17). It is pretty obvious that there was an inscription on the tomb of this team of mares. Were they all killed at once, in order to be buried together?

17. **Εὐαγόρεω.** Evagoras, like Miltiades, had a memorial-chariot at Olympia, Pausan. 6. 10, 8, which Hdt. may have seen.

18. **Στησαγόρης**, named after his paternal grandfather in accord with custom, was plainly the elder son. Miltiades gets his name from the oikist of the Chersonese, cp. c. 34 *supra*.

19. **πάτρῳ**, the *ὁμομήτριος ἀδελφεὸς* of Kimon is *πάτρως* to Kimon's sons. *πατράδελφος* would be a more correct term for the relationship. But cp. notes to cc. 34 ff. *supra*. If Kypselos f. of Miltiades had been full brother to Stesagoras f. of Kimon, Stesagoras the elder would have been *patruus* (as well as stepfather) of Miltiades the *oikist*: this Miltiades would have had an agnatic kinship with Kimon his *ὁμομήτριος ἀδελφεός*, and might therefore easily have been described as *πάτρως* to Stesagoras the younger.

104. 2. **ἥκων** (c. 41 *supra*) **ἐστρατήγεε Ἀθηναίων** again suggests, or at least would probably have suggested to readers in Hdt.'s own day, that Miltiades was commander-in-chief: though not, of course, that he was the *only* Strategos.

λαβεῖν τε καὶ ἀναγαγεῖν παρὰ βασιλέα· ἅμα δὲ ἐκφυγόντα τε τούτους καὶ ἀπικόμενον ἐς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ δοκέοντά τε εἶναι ἐν σωτηρίῃ ἤδη, τὸ ἐνθεῦτέν μιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ ὑποδεξάμενοι ὑπὸ δικαστήριον αὐτὸν ἀγαγόντες ἐδίωξαν τυραννίδος τῆς ἐν Χερσονήσῳ. ἀποφυγὼν δὲ καὶ τούτους στρατηγὸς οὕτω Ἀθηναίων ἀπεδέχθη, αἱρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου.

105 *Καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἐόντες ἔτι ἐν τῷ ἄστεϊ οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀποπέμπουσι ἐς Σπάρτην κήρυκα †Φειδιππίδην Ἀθηναῖον μὲν ἄνδρα, ἄλλως δὲ ἡμεροδρόμην τε καὶ τοῦτο μελετῶντα· τῷ δή, ὡς αὐτός τε ἔλεγε †Φειδιππίδης καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ἀπήγγελλε, περὶ τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος τὸ ὑπὲρ Τεγέης ὁ Πὰν περιπίπτει· βώσαντα δὲ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ †Φειδιππίδεω τὸν Πᾶνα Ἀθηναίοισι κελεῦσαι ἀπαγγεῖλαι, δι' ὅ τι ἑωυτοῦ οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμελείην ποιεῦνται ἐόντος εὐνόου Ἀθηναίοισι καὶ πολλαχῇ γενομένου σφι ἤδη χρησίμου, τὰ δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐσομένου. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι, καταστάντων σφι εὖ ἤδη τῶν πρηγμάτων, πιστεύσαντες εἶναι ἀληθέα ἱδρύσαντο ὑπὸ*

---

7. **οἱ ἐχθροί.** The Peisistratid party can scarcely by itself at that time have been strong enough for such action. If we may suppose that the enemies who prosecuted him on this occasion were the same as those who prosecuted him, more successfully, on a later occasion, then this prosecution was the work of a circle or clique to which Xanthippos belonged, *i.e.* presumably the Alkmaionid party. Cp. c. 136 *infra*, and Appendix XI.

δικαστήριον, 'a jury-court.' The procedure on the second occasion was different, cp. c. 136 *infra*. The Chersonese was already regarded as Ἀττικὴ γῆ (c. 140 *infra*), and a γραφὴ τυραννίδος, or the more general προδοσίας was known at least to the later Attic Law (cp. Meier and Schömann, *Das Attische Process*, 341 ff.). It is only remarkable that the procedure in this case is not by εἰσαγγελία, and that the Areiopagos has nothing to say to the matter. But such omissions in Hdt. are not surprising, nor can we be sure how far his report is discoloured by the analogies of the Reformed Judicature of Ephialtes. See Ἀθην. πολ. c. 25, Aristot. *Pol.* 2. 12, 2, 1274ᵃ. Is it possible that the δικαστήριον in this case was the Areiopagos? If so, among its services in the Persian wars (Aristot. *Pol.* 8. 4, 8, 1304ᵃ, Ἀθ. πολ. c. 23) would have to be reckoned its acquittal of Miltiades.

10. **αἱρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου,** *i.e.* by the Ekklesia, not merely by one of the Phylae. But this description is almost certainly an anachronism, though it may suit with the subsequent presentation of Miltiades as the ἡγεμὼν among the Strategi at Marathon (Ἀθ. πολ. c. 22. Cp. Appendix IX. § 13). The date of this election might be the spring of 490 B.C., or he may have been Strategos more than one year in succession.

105. 1. **ἐόντες ἔτι ἐν τῷ ἄστεϊ.** The mission of Philippides precedes the march to Marathon, which has already been specified, c. 103 *supra*, and neither grammatically nor materially is there any subsequent clause answering to the sentence introduced by πρῶτα μέν.

οἱ στρατηγοί, ten, or more? including the Polemarch? On these points Hdt. leaves us in the dark.

2. **Φειδιππίδην.** φιλιππίδην R et scriptorum testimonia (Stein). Φιλιππίδης must be right. The form is preserved by R, in Nepos, *vit. Milt.* 4, and in Pausan. 1. 28, 4, Pliny 7. 20, Solinus *l.c. infra* c. 106. Aristophanes would never have made 'Pheidippides' the son of Strepsiades, if the name had been consecrated in the Athenian traditions of Marathon: moreover, the corruption from Philippides to Pheidippides, for the ἡμεροδρόμης, is easier to understand than the reverse. Cp. further, Appendix X. § 3. The form **ἡμεροδρόμης** is guaranteed by a RV against S (Holder), and by a variation

*τῇ ἀκροπόλι Πανὸς ἱρόν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἀγγελίης
θυσίῃσι ἐπετείοισι καὶ λαμπάδι ἱλάσκονται. τότε δὲ πεμφθεὶς* 106
*ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν ὁ †Φειδιππίδης οὗτος, ὅτε πέρ οἱ ἔφη καὶ τὸν
Πᾶνα φανῆναι, δευτεραῖος ἐκ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ἄστεος ἦν ἐν Σπάρτῃ,
ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἔλεγε "ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι,
Ἀθηναῖοι ὑμέων δέονταί σφισι βοηθῆσαι καὶ μὴ περιιδεῖν πόλιν
ἀρχαιοτάτην ἐν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι δουλοσύνῃ περιπεσοῦσαν πρὸς
ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων· καὶ γὰρ νῦν Ἐρέτριά τε ἠνδραπόδισται καὶ
πόλι λογίμῳ ἡ Ἑλλὰς γέγονε ἀσθενεστέρη." ὁ μὲν δή σφι τὰ
ἐντεταλμένα ἀπήγγελλε, τοῖσι δὲ ἕαδε μὲν βοηθέειν Ἀθηναίοισι,
ἀδύνατα δέ σφι ἦν τὸ παραυτίκα ποιέειν ταῦτα, οὐ βουλομένοισι*

---

in Nepos, *Milt.* 4. L. & S.[7] do not recognise it.

11. **Πανὸς ἱρόν**, a cave on the north side of the Akropolis. Cp. Pausanias *l.c.* (*Descriptio Arcis Ath.* ed.[2] Jahn, p. 37, and the passages there quoted). That Pan was unworshipped at Athens until after his epiphany to Philippides on Mt. Parthenion and the panic of the Persians at Marathon seems improbable. Cp. *πολλαχῇ <μὲν>* (Naber) *γενομένου σφι ἤδη χρησίμου.* The cult was perhaps revived after the god's service at Marathon. On the connexion with Arkadia cp. 4. 203. Blakesley (notes 240-242) has some interesting conjectures, but he is wrong in taking *λαμπὰς* as an 'illumination.' In the grotto was a statue of Pan dedicated by Miltiades, with the following inscription by Simonides:

τὸν τραγόπουν ἐμὲ Πᾶνα τὸν Ἀρκάδα τὸν κατὰ Μήδων
τὸν μετ' Ἀθηναίων στήσατο Μιλτιάδης.

(But cp. Appendix X. § 15, and Introduction, p. lxiv.)

M. Breton (*Athènes*, 2 Ed. p. 186) has the remark: "Chr. Wordsworth (*Athens and Attica*, c. xii.) prétend que cette statue orne aujourd'hui le vestibule de la bibliothèque de Cambridge." But all that Wordsworth affirmed (*op. cit.*[4] p. 69) is that the statue in the grotto was "perhaps that which was dedicated by Miltiades, and for which Simonides wrote the inscription, and that now stands in the vestibule of the Public Library at Cambridge." The statue in question is doubtless that in the Fitzwilliam Museum. Clarke, xi. *τροπαιοφόρος*, "discovered in a garden below the grotto of Pan at the foot of the Akropolis of Athens." See Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, p. 246 (*ed.* Fennell, 1882).

106. 1. **τότε δὲ** in contrast to *ταῦτα μὲν καταστάντων εὖ τ. πρ.* just above, and antecedent to *ὅτε περ* just below.

3. **δευτεραῖος** on the next day, *i.e.* within twenty-four hours. Solinus (ed. Mommsen, pp. 26, 27) giving 'records' for swiftness of foot, this one included, estimates the distance at 1240 stadia. The passage is taken from Pliny, 7. 20 (84), where the received text has MCXL stadia: one C has probably dropped out (cp. *Plinii Nat. Hist. l.c.* ed. Lemaire).

4. **τοὺς ἄρχοντας**, not the king, or kings alone, anyway, cp. c. 67 *supra* (but cp. 5. 49 *supra*, 9. 7).

6. **ἀρχαιοτάτην.** The regular Athenian view, and doubtless just, cp. Thucyd. 1. 2, 5. Athens was of immemorial antiquity, the absence of a (Dorian) conquest facilitating the assumption of 'autochthonism.'

8. **ἡ Ἑλλάς**, a remarkable instance of the ethical significance of this term 'Hellendom' (making it nearly equivalent to *τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν* 8. 144). Cp. 5. 49 *supra*, 7. 197.

9. **τοῖσι δὲ ἕαδε.** It would be fallacious to argue from this passage that it was possible (constitutional) at this date *φρουρὰν φαίνειν* without an antecedent vote of the Apella, authorising the policy. The exact moment for mobilisation or action may have been left to the authorities, now, as in much later days. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 5, 10 may be taken as an example of the normal procedure: *τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐδόκει βοηθητέον εἶναι* (= *τοῖσι δὲ ἕαδε βοηθέειν*) . . *φρουρὰν μὲν οἱ ἔφοροι ἔφαινον· Ἀγησίλαον*

λύειν τὸν νόμον· ἦν γὰρ ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς εἰνάτη, εἰνάτῃ δὲ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεσθαι ἔφασαν μὴ οὐ πλήρεος ἐόντος τοῦ κύκλου.

107 *Οὗτοι μέν νυν τὴν πανσέληνον ἔμενον. τοῖσι δὲ βαρβάροισι κατηγέετο Ἱππίης ὁ Πεισιστράτου ἐς τὸν Μαραθῶνα, τῆς παροιχομένης νυκτὸς ὄψιν ἰδὼν τοιήνδε· ἐδόκεε ὁ Ἱππίης τῇ μητρὶ τῇ ἑωυτοῦ συνευνηθῆναι. συνεβάλετο ὦν ἐκ τοῦ ὀνείρου κατελθὼν ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ ἀνασωσάμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν τελευτήσειν ἐν τῇ ἑωυτοῦ γηραιός. ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς ὄψιος συνεβάλετο ταῦτα, τότε δὲ κατηγεόμενος τοῦτο μὲν τὰ ἀνδράποδα τὰ ἐξ Ἐρετρίης ἀπέβησε ἐς τὴν νῆσον τὴν Στυρέων, καλεομένην δὲ Αἰγλείην, τοῦτο δὲ καταγομένας ἐς τὸν Μαραθῶνα τὰς νέας ὅρμιζε οὗτος, ἐκβάντας τε ἐς γῆν τοὺς βαρβάρους διέτασσε. καί οἱ ταῦτα διέποντι ἐπῆλθε πταρεῖν τε καὶ βῆξαι μεζόνως ἢ ὡς ἐώθεε· οἷα δέ οἱ πρεσβυτέρῳ ἐόντι τῶν ὀδόντων οἱ πλεῦνες ἐσείοντο· τούτων ὦν ἕνα τῶν ὀδόντων ἐκβάλλει ὑπὸ βίης βήξας· ἐκπεσόντος δὲ ἐς τὴν ψάμμον αὐτοῦ ἐποιέετο σπουδὴν πολλὴν ἐξευρεῖν. ὡς δὲ οὐκ*

δ' ἐκέλευεν ἡ πόλις ἡγεῖσθαι. Cp. 5. 64 *supra*, Appendix VII. § 8.

11. **ἦν γὰρ κτλ.** We must take this passage to mean that the Spartans could not start on the ninth, or any other day, till full moon (15th), and not that the full moon might have fallen on the ninth. Did this rule hold for all months, or only for this particular month? The ancients understood the rule as valid generally, cp. Pausan. 1. 28, 4, Schol. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 84, Plutarch, *Mor.* 861. Stein confines the rule to the month Karneios, in which the festival lasted from 7th to 15th. It seems well-nigh incredible that the Spartans should have put up with such a hindrance to military operations every month. The limitation of the obstruction to a single month makes it more possible to maintain with Grote, and against Rawlinson, the *bona fides* of the Spartans on this occasion. The great haste which they used when they started on the 15th points to the same conclusion. This argument of course assumes the truth of the tradition, and that the action, or inaction, of the Spartans has not been rationalised, or religionised, by afterthought. Cp. Appendix VII. § 11 *ad finem*.

12. **μὴ οὐ**, cp. c. 88 *supra*.

107. 1. **τοῖσι δὲ βαρβάροισι κτλ.** 'the night before Hippias, son of Peisistratos, conducted the barbarians to Marathon he had sight of a vision as follows.' Cp. c. 102 *supra*, where Hippias has already led the barbarians to Marathon.

3. **ἐδόκεε ὁ Ἱππίης κτλ.** Whether Hippias had any such dream as that here ascribed to him; whether he coughed a tooth out on the sand of Marathon; whether he conjectured that the latter misfortune was a fulfilment of the former visitation, and made known this depressing conjecture to those about him; these are questions which can be decided only on general grounds. The story is not inappropriate to the reputation of Hippias for piety of a certain kind. Cp. 5. 93 *supra*. His brother Hipparchos was a dreamer too, 5. 56 *supra*, but the story reads rather like a bitter jest at the exiled despot's expense. Cp. Appendix X. § 3.

7. **τοῦτο μὲν . . τοῦτο δέ.** The record here seems to represent Hippias not merely as guide, but as Field-Marshal of the Persian forces (*τὰ ἀνδράποδα . . ἀπέβησε . . τὰς νέας ὅρμιζε οὗτος . . τοὺς βαρβάρους διέτασσε*). It is important to observe that the ships were left riding at anchor, not drawn up on shore.

8. **Αἰγλείην**, v. l. *Αἰγίλειαν* PR, may be identified with the island lying almost directly between Styra, in Euboea, and Kynossema, by Marathon: although there is no ancient authority for the identification.

14. **ἐποιέετο**, 'he caused diligent

ἐφαίνετό οἱ ὁ ὀδών, ἀναστενάξας εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς παραστάτας "ἡ γῆ ἥδε οὐκ ἡμετέρη ἐστί, οὐδέ μιν δυνησόμεθα ὑποχειρίην ποιήσασθαι· ὁκόσον δέ τι μοι μέρος μετῆν, ὁ ὀδὼν μετέχει."

108 Ἱππίης μὲν δὴ ταύτῃ τὴν ὄψιν συνεβάλετο ἐξεληλυθέναι. Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ τεταγμένοισι ἐν τεμένεϊ Ἡρακλέος ἐπῆλθον βοηθέοντες Πλαταιέες πανδημεί. καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐδεδώκεσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι οἱ Πλαταιέες, καὶ πόνους ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συχνοὺς ἤδη ἀναραιρέατο· ἔδοσαν δὲ ὧδε. πιεζεύμενοι ὑπὸ Θηβαίων οἱ Πλαταιέες ἐδίδοσαν πρῶτα παρατυχοῦσι Κλεομένεϊ τε τῷ Ἀναξανδρίδεω καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοισι σφέας αὐτούς. οἱ δὲ οὐ δεκόμενοι ἔλεγόν σφι τάδε. "ἡμεῖς μὲν

---

search to be made for his tooth.' Van Herwerden improves the text by removing τῶν ὀδόντων[2], βήξας and αὐτοῦ. The sand (ψάμμος) is observable: cp. Appendix X. §§ 9, 35.

108. 2. **τεμένεϊ Ἡρακλέος.** This is the Herakleion at Marathon presumably, and not the Herakleion in Kynosargos, cc. 116 *infra*, 103 *supra*. The cult of Herakles at Marathon was accounted the oldest in Greece (Pausan. 1. 32, 4) and was perhaps a Phoenician importation. Strictly speaking, this close was not at 'Marathon,' but near the modern Vrana, as Lolling appears to have proved (*Mitth. des D. arch. Instituts*, i. 89 ff.). This determination of the site must govern our conception of the operations. See Appendix X. § 31.

4. **πόνους**, *e.g.* the war with Thebes 5. 77 *supra*, where, however, their services are ignored.

5. **ὧδε.** That the account of the origin of the alliance between Athens and Plataia should be introduced here, out of its natural and chronological relations, is remarkable, the more so as Hdt. has already narrated no less than three expeditions of Kleomenes into central Greece (5. 64, 72, 74 *supra*), to one of which this episode must be supposed to belong. This inconsequence might be explained by the supposition that Hdt. had composed the story of Marathon, this *excursus* included, before composing the narrative in the fifth Book where it would have come in more appropriately: in that case, however, we might have expected a forward reference to this passage in the fifth Book. (There is a parallel case to such an omission in the story of the μῆνις Ταλθυβίου 7. 133 ff., cpd. with 6. 48, 94.) Or the story of the Plataian alliance may have formed an integral portion of the (Attic) tradition about the battle of Marathon, and Hdt. may be keeping close to his sources. Or the explanation might be sought in the supposition that before Hdt. composed the story of Marathon special attention had been attracted to the case of Plataia and its relations to Athens, as in 431 B.C. (Thuc. 2, *ad init.*). That this passage was written or revised after the destruction of Plataia in 427 B.C. (Thuc. 3. 68) seems improbable. It might be a late insertion (by Hdt.'s own hand), though why in this case he did not insert it in its natural place in Bk. 5, is not very evident.

7. **Κλεομένεϊ.** Thuc. 3. 68, 2 dates the alliance ninety-two years before the destruction in 427 B.C. That date brings us to 519 B.C. Grote, in an unanswerable note (vol. iii. p. 583, pt. ii. c. xxxi.), has proved that this date is highly improbable. It is not, however, necessary to suppose that Thucydides in this case committed a blunder. Let it be granted that a copyist added one Δ too many (𐅄ΔΔΔΔIII for 𐅄ΔΔΔIII) in an uncial MS. of Thucydides, and the error is traced to the likeliest source. (This is the suggestion of the late Professor A. von Gutschmid, cp. Busolt, *Die Lakedaimonier*, i. 307 n.) The date of the alliance is 509 B.C. if the application to Kleomenes was made on the occasion of his second expedition into Attica: cp. 5. 72 *supra*. Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alterth.* ii. p. 780, § 478 n. (1893), reverts to the earlier date, but he does not explain what Kleomenes <and the

ἑκαστέρω τε οἰκέομεν, καὶ ὑμῖν τοιήδε τις γίνοιτ' ἂν ἐπικουρίη ψυχρή· φθαίητε γὰρ ἂν πολλάκις ἐξανδραποδισθέντες ἤ τινα πυθέσθαι ἡμέων. συμβουλεύομεν δὲ ὑμῖν δοῦναι ὑμέας αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίοισι, πλησιοχώροισί τε ἀνδράσι καὶ τιμωρέειν ἐοῦσι οὐ κακοῖσι." ταῦτα συνεβούλευον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐ κατὰ τὴν εὐνοίην οὕτω τῶν Πλαταιέων ὡς βουλόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἔχειν πόνους συνεστεῶτας Βοιωτοῖσι. Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέν νυν Πλαταιεῦσι ταῦτα συνεβούλευον, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἠπίστησαν, ἀλλ' Ἀθηναίων ἱρὰ ποιεύντων τοῖσι δυώδεκα θεοῖσι ἱκέται ἱζόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἐδίδοσαν σφέας αὐτούς. Θηβαῖοι δὲ πυθόμενοι ταῦτα ἐστρατεύοντο ἐπὶ τοὺς Πλαταιέας, Ἀθηναῖοι δέ σφι ἐβοήθεον. μελλόντων δὲ συνάπτειν μάχην Κορίνθιοι οὐ περιεῖδον, παρατυχόντες δὲ καὶ καταλλάξαντες ἐπιτρεψάντων ἀμφοτέρων οὔρισαν τὴν χώρην ἐπὶ τοισίδε, ἐὰν Θηβαίους Βοιωτῶν τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους ἐς Βοιωτοὺς τελέειν. Κορίνθιοι μὲν δὴ ταῦτα γνόντες ἀπαλλάσσοντο, Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ ἀπιοῦσι ἐπεθήκαντο Βοιωτοί, ἐπιθέμενοι δὲ ἑσσώθησαν τῇ μάχῃ. ὑπερβάντες δὲ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἔθηκαν Πλαταιεῦσι εἶναι οὔρους, τούτους ὑπερβάντες τὸν Ἀσωπὸν αὐτὸν ἐποιήσαντο οὖρον Θηβαίοισι πρὸς Πλαταιέας εἶναι καὶ Ὑσιάς. ἔδοσαν μὲν δὴ οἱ Πλαταιέες σφέας αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίοισι τρόπῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ, ἧκον δὲ τότε ἐς Μαραθῶνα βοηθέοντες.

109 Τοῖσι δὲ Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοῖσι ἐγίνοντο δίχα αἱ γνῶμαι,

Lakedaimonians > were doing 'near the Isthmus' in 519 B.C.

13. **ταῦτα κτλ.** This critical remark is more in the style of an Athenian politician than in the style of our author. Cp. Introduction, p. cviii.

τὴν εὐνοίην . . τῶν Π. 'objective' genitive. Cp. 'the fear of the Lord.'

15. **συνεστεῶτας**, *sc.* τοὺς Ἀθηναίους.

17. **τοῖσι δυώδεκα θεοῖσι.** Cp. 2. 4. In Athens the *Dodekatheon* embraced Zeus and Hera, Poseidon and Demeter, Apollo and Artemis, Hephaistos and Athene, Ares and Aphrodite, Hermes and Hestia. At Olympia the list was otherwise composed. Cp. Schömann, *Gr. Alt.* ii.^{3} 135, who suggests that the number may have been suggested by the number of months in the year. This altar was erected by Peisistratos the younger. Cp. Thuc. 6. 54, 6. On the supposed copy of it in the Louvre, cp. K. O. Müller, *Ancient Art*, § 96. 22 (E. T. p. 63), Overbeck, *Gesch. d. Gr. Plastik*, i.^{4} 258. The festival was perhaps the Panathenaic, during which the procession halted at this altar, Xen. *Hipp.* 3. 2, A. Mommsen, *Heort.* p. 394.

21. **καταλλάξαντες.** On the practice of arbitration, cp. 5. 29. The παρατυχόντες here is probably a mere phrase to cover ignorance, cp. παρατυχοῦσι *supra.* On the policy of Corinth cp. c. 89 *supra*, 5. 92, 93. It may be observed that the Corinthian orator in Thucydides 1. 41 does not include this arbitration in the list of services to Athens.

23. **ἐς Β. τελέειν.** Cp. c. 53. l. 6 *supra.*

25. **τῇ μάχῃ.** This cannot possibly be the victory recorded in 5. 77 *supra*, for (1) the circumstances are different, (2) it precedes the annexation of Hysiae, cp. 5. 74 *supra.* It therefore precedes the expedition of the Peloponnesians there recorded.

109. 1. **δίχα αἱ γνῶμαι.** This council of war is localised at Marathon. The question before the Strategi (for the Polemarch is *ex hypothesi* not present)

τῶν μὲν οὐκ ἐώντων συμβαλεῖν (ὀλίγους γὰρ εἶναι) στρατιῇ τῇ Μήδων [συμβάλλειν], τῶν δὲ καὶ Μιλτιάδεω κελευόντων. ὡς δὲ δίχα τε ἐγίνοντο καὶ ἐνίκα ἡ χείρων τῶν γνωμέων, ἐνθαῦτα, ἦν γὰρ ἑνδέκατος ψηφιδοφόρος ὁ τῷ κυάμῳ λαχὼν Ἀθηναίων πολεμαρχέειν (τὸ παλαιὸν γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι ὁμόψηφον τὸν πολέμαρχον ἐποιεῦντο τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι), ἦν δὲ τότε πολέμαρχος Καλλίμαχος

---

is whether to risk a battle or to act on the defensive. The previous question, whether to go out or to remain in the city, must have been raised before the march to Marathon, c. 103 *supra*; but of this point Hdt. takes virtually no account. Cp. case of Eretria, c. 101 *supra*, and see Appendix X. § 26.

3. **τῶν δὲ καί.** Perhaps Aristeides and the gallant Stesilaos son of Thrasylaos (cp. c. 105 *supra*), possibly even Themistokles, were among the four who supported the better judgment of Miltiades. **συμβάλλειν** *del.* Stein.

5. **ὁ τῷ κυάμῳ λαχὼν πολεμαρχέειν.** This incidental phrase cannot prove that the lot had been introduced by Kleisthenes for the Archontate: at most it proves that the Polemarch was appointed by sortition, perhaps out of the college of nine Archons, after their election *χειροτονίᾳ*. But the general assumption that Hdt. thought of the Archons as appointed in 490 B.C. as they were certainly appointed in 430 B.C. *κλήρῳ* or *κυάμῳ* need not be gainsaid. It is far more likely, however, that Hdt. should have been guilty of an anachronism in the constitutional history of Athens, than that the lot was introduced so early as is here implied. Is Hdt. such a high authority on political and constitutional perspectives? Are anachronisms so rare in his pages? Moreover, this matter of the lot is not what he is here mainly concerned about: at the time he is writing the Polemarch and the other Archons obtain office by sortition, but the Polemarch has ceased to be *ὁμόψηφος τοῖσι στρατηγοῖσι*: it is this fact, that in the days of Marathon the Polemarch was still a member of the college of commanders, not the circumstance that he was already an officer *κυαμευτός*, which affects the story. What the exact position of the Polemarch was in 490 B.C. Hdt. does not clearly indicate, but he does not say that the Polemarch had merely a casting vote in case of an equidecision among ten Strategi. The Polemarch was *ὁμόψηφος τ. στ.* He voted therefore on all occasions. He must have been consulted before the army left Athens (c. 103), before the mission of Philippides (c. 105); and not merely at the eleventh hour. The Polemarch also fights on the right wing—nay commands it (c. 111 *infra*). There is indeed only one supposition which fairly makes sense of the story of Marathon. In 490 B.C. the Polemarch was still commander-in-chief, and the Strategi formed his council of war. As commander-in-chief he led the right wing, the post of honour and danger in a Greek army. Miltiades probably was the intellectual author of the Athenian tactics at Marathon, but he was not *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ*, which is virtually the position assigned to him in the traditions of the Periklean age. It was Kallimachos not Miltiades who commanded at Marathon. This theory, if correct, makes it more absurd than ever to suppose that the Polemarch was *κυαμευτός*. On the question of the introduction of the lot see further: *On the significance of the Lot and the date of its introduction at Athens* in the Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society 1886/7. [Also J. W. Headlam, *Election by Lot at Athens*, Cambr. 1891.]

This note so far has been left intact, as written years before the discovery of the treatise on the *Athenian Polity*, ascribed to Aristotle, which has the express statement for the date of Marathon: *τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ᾑροῦντο κατὰ φυλάς, ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἕνα, τῆς δὲ ἁπάσης στρατιᾶς ἡγεμὼν ἦν ὁ πολέμαρχος* c. 22. This statement was probably intended to clear up the obscurity in regard to the part played by the Polemarch in Hdt.'s account of the Marathonian affair, which may have perplexed Athenian students in the fourth century B.C. as it has perplexed all modern students who have given any attention to it. It does not, however,

Ἀφιδναῖος· πρὸς τοῦτον ἐλθὼν Μιλτιάδης ἔλεγε τάδε. "ἐν σοὶ νῦν Καλλίμαχε ἔστι ἢ καταδουλῶσαι Ἀθήνας ἢ ἐλευθέρας ποιήσαντα μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα ἀνθρώπων βίον οἷα οὐδὲ Ἁρμόδιός τε καὶ Ἀριστογείτων [λείπουσι]. νῦν γὰρ δὴ ἐξ οὗ ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς κίνδυνον ἥκουσι μέγιστον, καὶ ἢν μέν γε ὑποκύψωσι τοῖσι Μήδοισι, δέδοκται τὰ πείσονται παραδεδομένοι Ἱππίῃ, ἢν δὲ περιγένηται αὕτη ἡ πόλις, οἵη τέ ἐστι πρώτη τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πολίων γενέσθαι. κῶς ὦν δὴ ταῦτα οἷά τέ ἐστι γενέσθαι, καὶ κῶς ἐς σέ τοι τούτων ἀνήκει τῶν πρηγμάτων τὸ κῦρος ἔχειν, νῦν ἔρχομαι φράσων. ἡμέων τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐόντων δέκα δίχα γίνονται αἱ γνῶμαι, τῶν μὲν κελευόντων τῶν δὲ οὐ συμβάλλειν. ἢν μέν νυν μὴ συμβάλωμεν, ἔλπομαί τινα στάσιν μεγάλην διασείσειν ἐμπεσοῦσαν τὰ Ἀθηναίων φρονήματα ὥστε μηδίσαι· ἢν δὲ συμβάλωμεν πρίν τι καὶ σαθρὸν Ἀθηναίων μετεξετέροισι ἐγγενέσθαι, θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων οἷοί τε εἰμὲν περιγενέσθαι τῇ συμβολῇ. ταῦτα ὦν πάντα ἐς σὲ νῦν τείνει καὶ ἐκ σέο ἤρτηται. ἢν γὰρ σὺ γνώμῃ τῇ ἐμῇ προσθῇ, ἔστι τοι πατρίς τε ἐλευθέρη καὶ πόλις πρώτη τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι· ἢν δὲ τὴν τῶν

---

follow that the statement in the Ἀθ. πολ. is based on historical testimony or tradition, as distinct from inference. The inference made in the nineteenth cent. P.C. may have been anticipated in the fourth cent. A.C. Cp. Appendices IX. § 13, X. § 5.

8. **ἐλθὼν** seems to carry out the assumption that the Polemarch had not been present at the previous council or debate: and so do the terms of the speech which follows.

τάδε. This speech appears to be coloured by later ideas; at least it may be doubted whether Miltiades would have shared the (later) popular view of the services of Harmodios and Aristogeiton to the cause of liberty (cp. Thuc. 6. 54, and the *Lives*, Marcell. § 2, Anonym. § 1). The future augured for Athens may be thought unlikely before the event. There is, however, special point in the allusion. These Gephyraeans (5. 57 *supra*) were from Aphidna, like Kallimachos himself (Plutarch, *Moral.* 628), and in later times at least the Polemarch conducted the festival in their honour, Ἀθ. πολ. c. 58. The argument of Miltiades seems rather belated, if first urged at Vrana. (Cp. the case of Eretria, cc. 100, 101 *supra*.) It does not belong to Hdt.'s method to inform his hearers (or readers) from what source he derived knowledge of this intimate conference. He is, however, rarely at a loss on these occasions, cp. 4. 137, 5. 49 *supra*, 3. 80, etc., etc.

ἐν σοὶ reappears in the appeal of Themistokles to Eurybiades, 8. 60. Cp. *ἐς σέ, ἐκ σέο infra*, and with *ἐξ οὗ ἐγ.* Ἀθ. cp. *πόλιν ἀρχαιοτάτην*, c. 106 *supra*.

11. **λείπουσι** *secl.* Stein.

14. **πρώτη.** Is this prophecy or history?

17. **νῦν ἔρχομαι φράσων.** This information might be useful for Hdt.'s public, but could hardly have been necessary from Miltiades to Kallimachos.

19. **στάσιν.** The justice of this expectation (or reflection) is shown by the story of the shield, cc. 115, 121-124, and would in any case have been obvious in the light of Eretria, c. 101, Aigina, c. 49, and the state of parties in Athens itself.

22. **θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων**, c. 11 *supra*.

25. **πόλις πρώτη τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι**: cp. *πρώτη τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πολίων supra*. The unhistorical character of this speech is discovered by these phrases, which not only betray the influence of later days, but are out of keeping even with the hypothetical situation. On the eve of

ἀποσπευδόντων τὴν συμβολὴν ἕλῃ, ὑπάρξει τοι τῶν ἐγὼ κατέλεξα ἀγαθῶν τὰ ἐναντία."

Ταῦτα λέγων ὁ Μιλτιάδης προσκτᾶται τὸν Καλλίμαχον· 110
προσγενομένης δὲ τοῦ πολεμάρχου τῆς γνώμης ἐκεκύρωτο συμβάλλειν. μετὰ δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν ἡ γνώμη ἔφερε συμβάλλειν, ὡς ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ἐγίνετο πρυτανηίη τῆς ἡμέρης, Μιλτιάδῃ παρ-

---

Marathon Kallimachos and Miltiades may have been discussing the questions whether to expect or to deliver an attack, and at what moment: but hardly the prospects of an Athenian primacy.

110. 3. **οἱ στρατηγοὶ . . παρεδίδοσαν,** cp. c. 109 *supra*. There were four of them, and apparently the πρυτανηίη came to each one of them, before it reached Miltiades. Each yielded the honour to Miltiades, yet he postpones the engagement until his own day comes round: an inexplicable inconsequence on the showing of Hdt. Perhaps the real question with Miltiades, or rather with Kallimachos, was that the Athenians should deliver the attack, and not act merely on the defensive, rather than the question of delivering the attack on any particular day. To attack without waiting for the Spartans — unless some special circumstance arose to make an immediate attack advisable—might well have seemed an act of folly. Van Herwerden cuts the knot by inserting οὐ before δεκόμενος.

4. **πρυτανηίη.** The word has been generally supposed in this passage to mean 'the command-in-chief,' cp. L. & S. *sub v.* where no parallel is adduced. Plutarch seems to have taken this view of the passage, see *Aristeid.* c. 5. If, however, the supreme command was really vested in the Polemarch, and the Strategi commanded each only a *Phyle*, some other meaning must be sought for πρυτανηίη, or the word is here used incorrectly. Whether Hdt. understood its correct use is another question.

In what sense, or senses, could there be a daily change in the πρυτανηίη of the Strategi, the ἡγεμονία of the Polemarch remaining intact?

In one sense πρυτανεία was the period during which the βουλευταί of each Phyle were, so to speak, in office, *i.e.* one-tenth of the year. That order was determined by lot. Did the order of the Phylae in battle follow the order of the phylic prytanies for the year? Did the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή for the time being hold the post of honour, with its Strategos, on the right wing, immediately in touch with the Polemarch? (So Rawlinson, cp. note *infra.*) Might the Strategos be said to be πρυτανεύων while his Phyle was πρυτανεύουσα?

One great objection to that explanation may lie in the succeeding words ὡς ἀριθμέοντο αἱ φυλαί, but another objection already lies in the clear indication that the πρυτανεία in the army changed every day. So also the Scholiast on Thuc. 4. 118 (qu. by Krüger) has ἡμέρα καθ' ἣν ἔχει τις ἐξουσίαν, though the πρυτάνεις mentioned there are civil officials. If the πρυτανεία on the field of battle changed day by day, it can hardly have been identical with, or dependent on, the allotted order of the buleutic prytanies for the year.

It is not in itself improbable that there was a daily change in the order of the Phyles in battle-array, or some rotation of *primacy*, or *dignity*, among the phylic regiments, and their commanders, the supreme lead and command of the Polemarch remaining unaffected. Such an arrangement obtained in the army of Alexander the Great, and would have been thoroughly in accord with Athenian spirit (cp. 5. 78 *supra*). The term in Alexander's army appears to have been ἡγεμονία, applied whether to the regiment, or to its commander (cp. Arrian, *Anabasis*, 1. 14. 6, 28. 3; 5. 13. 4). The πρυτανηίη here may correspond to the ἡγημονία there, the former word being, perhaps, employed in order to avoid clashing with the ἡγεμονία of the Polemarch.

If this explanation be adopted, it follows that, on the day of battle, Miltiades, with the tribe he commanded, stood on the right wing. What tribe did Miltiades command? What tribe stood right, on the day of Marathon? If Miltiades belonged to the deme Lakiadai, and if he was in command of his own *Phyletai*, the *Oineis* was the tribe

ἐδίδοσαν· ὁ δὲ δεκόμενος οὔτι κω συμβολὴν ἐποιέετο, πρίν γε δὴ
111 αὐτοῦ πρυτανηίη ἐγένετο. ὡς δὲ ἐς ἐκεῖνον περιῆλθε, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ἐτάσσοντο ὧδε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὡς συμβαλέοντες· τοῦ μὲν δεξιοῦ κέρεος ἡγέετο ὁ πολέμαρχος Καλλίμαχος· ὁ γὰρ νόμος τότε εἶχε οὕτω τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι, τὸν πολέμαρχον ἔχειν κέρας τὸ δεξιόν· ἡγεομένου δὲ τούτου ἐξεδέκοντο ὡς ἀριθμέοντο αἱ φυλαὶ ἐχόμεναι

---

in question. The attempt (Lugebil, *Z. Geschichte d. Staatsverf. v. Athen*, ii. § 17) to show that, in the time of the ten *Phylae*, Lakiadai may have belonged to the *Aiantis*, is disproved by *C.I.A.* ii. 868, p. 340, where that deme belongs to the Oineis in Ol. 105. 1 = 360-59 B.C. From another inscription, *C.I.A.* i. 179, it appears that Lakedaimonios (grandson of Miltiades) belonged to Lakiadai, 433-2 B.C. But, is it absolutely certain that Miltiades in 490 B.C. must have been 'settled' in Lakiadai, or, even if so settled, could under no circumstances have commanded any other Phyle? The Aiantis is recorded to have occupied the right wing, at the battle of Marathon, upon the authority of Aischylos *apud* Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* 1. 10 = *Moral.* 628, cp. Appendix X. § 27. The Philaid Miltiades would have had special claims upon the Aiantis, named after his heroic ancestor: is it certain that he was not in command of that Phyle? (The deme, *Philaidai*, by the way, belonged to the *Aigeis.*) Anyway, whatever Phyle Miltiades commanded, whatever Phyle stood on the right wing, beside the Polemarch at Marathon, the word πρυτανηίη may have been used correctly here, even if Herodotus erroneously took it to mean 'supreme command.'

Whether, after the reform of the *Polemarchia*, the supremacy in the college of Strategi, in the absence of a special psephism or enactment, rotated daily, is a moot question, cp. Plutarch, *l.c. supra*, Diodoros 13. 97 (Arginusae), 13. 106 (Aigos-potami). See further, Appendix IX. § 14.

111. 3. **ἡγέετο . . ἔχειν** cannot mean merely that the Polemarch stood as extreme man upon the right wing. Perhaps he stood there, but in a position of supreme authority. Lugebil, *op. cit.* §§ 12 ff., has shown that such was the general rule in Greek armies, but his further argument to show that Hdt. clearly understood the Polemarch at Marathon to have been commander-in-chief is unacceptable: cp. previous note, and Appendix X. § 5.

5. **ἐξεδέκοντο ὡς ἀριθμέοντο αἱ φυλαί.** Plutarch, *Mor.* 628, asserts that Kallimachos belonged to the Aiantis, and assuming that the Polemarch's *Phyle* stood beside the Polemarch, Stein[3] (1874) proposed to read αἱ ἄλλαι φυλαί, following Valla's *ceterae tribus*. This merges the *Phyle* in the Polemarch, and implies that the Aiantis stood on the right, and stood there irrespective of the πρυτανεία. Hdt. says αἱ φυλαί, *i.e.* the *Phylae*, without exception, stood from right to left ὡς ἀριθμέοντο: *i.e.* as generally understood 'according to the allotted order for the succession of prytanies for the year,' an order which changed every year. The Aiantis stood right as the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή (so Rawlinson). Stein assuming that Miltiades was in command of the Oineis, and that δέκατος means last (instead of first) puts Oineis next the Plataians. In that case Miltiades might have commanded or led the whole left wing, and we might find the πρύτανις on the left, and the ἡγεμών on the right. But this combination is not trustworthy, cp. c. 103 *supra*.

Stein[5] (1882) now argues that, as Hdt. did not write αἱ ἄλλαι φυλαί, he must have been ignorant of the tradition that the Aiantis was on the right wing. He regards the tradition as itself untrustworthy: but it has the authority of Aischylos, cp. note *supra*. As above pointed out it was a coincidence, or an omen, perhaps contrived, that the Aiantis (to which the neighbouring *Demi* and the Polemarch belonged, and which Miltiades, perhaps, commanded) was on the right.

Our conception of the actual order in which the Phylae, or tribes, stood on the day of battle, turns largely on the meaning of the words ὡς ἀριθμέοντο. Lugebil, *op. cit.* § 18, has argued that the words refer to the fixed and official order of the Phylae: the imperfect is

ἀλληλέων, τελευταῖοι δὲ ἐτάσσοντο ἔχοντες τὸ εὐώνυμον κέρας Πλαταιέες. ἀπὸ ταύτης [γάρ] σφι τῆς μάχης, Ἀθηναίων θυσίας ἀναγόντων ἐς τὰς πανηγύριας τὰς ἐν τῇσι πεντετηρίσι γινομένας, κατεύχεται ὁ κῆρυξ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἅμα τε Ἀθηναίοισι λέγων γίνεσθαι τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ Πλαταιεῦσι. τότε δὲ τασσομένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῷ Μαραθῶνι ἐγίνετο τοιόνδε τι· τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐξισούμενον τῷ Μηδικῷ στρατοπέδῳ, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ μέσον ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ τάξιας ὀλίγας, καὶ ταύτῃ ἦν ἀσθενέστατον τὸ στρατόπεδον, τὸ δὲ κέρας ἑκάτερον ἔρρωτο πλήθεϊ. ὡς δέ σφι διετέτακτο καὶ 112

---

no bar to this interpretation, and the word ἀριθμεῖν naturally suggests a fixed list; but surely it might equally refer to either order, the changing order of a sortition, or the fixed order of the catalogue. Either order would be perfectly consistent with a daily change in the ἡγεμονία or πρυτανηίη (see note above). The fixed order of the Phylae was Erechtheis, Aigeis, Pandionis, Leontis, Akamantis, Oineis, Kekropis, Hippothontis, Aiantis, Antiochis. (Cp. Appendix IX. § 9 *ad fin.*) According to Plutarch, *Aristeid.* 5, the Antiochis and the Leontis were in the centre. If the order of battle had followed not an allotted but the fixed order of the tribes, Leontis and Antiochis could not have stood together in the centre, or anywhere. Lugebil discredits the whole anecdote as a mere fiction to illustrate the notorious rivalry of Themistokles and Aristeides: but the position of the two tribes would be intelligible on the hypothesis of sortition; the rivalry might have been illustrated without bringing the tribes into actual juxtaposition. If the order was according to the catalogue, the following inferences are legitimate. Given Aiantis (Miltiades) on the right, the tribes would have succeeded as follows: Antiochis (under Aristeides), Erechtheis, Aigeis, Pandionis, Leontis (with Themistokles), Akamantis, Oineis (Miltiades!), Kekropis, Hippothontis. Given Oineis (Miltiades) on the right, there follow Kekropis, Hippothontis, Aiantis (!), Antiochis (Aristeides), and so on, Leontis (Themistokles) being last but one. Given Oineis on the extreme left, Kekropis will be extreme right, Aiantis third, Antiochis fourth, Leontis eighth.

7, 8. **ἀναγόντων**, cp. *θυσίας ἀνάγουσι* 5. 119 *supra*. *γὰρ seclusit* Stein.

πεντετηρίσι. The reference is probably to the Panathenaia. Cp. c. 108 *supra*. This was not the only honour done, in course of time, to the Plataians: on the walls of the Poikile Stoa they were recognisable, in the Marathonian fresco, by their Boeotian helmets, [Dem.] *c. Neaer.* 94. Cp. Appendix X. § 20. It seems well-nigh inconceivable that this passage should have been written by Herodotus after the destruction of Plataia in 427 B.C. Cp. c. 108 *supra*. Whether Hdt. had himself heard the prayer at one of the festivals is not clear. Cp. c. 112 *infra*.

11. **ἐγίνετο τοιόνδε τι.** This arrangement was hardly an accident. Though it explains and in a way justifies the retreat of the centre, we need not suppose that it was a fiction coined for the purpose, nor is it likely that the numbers of each Phyle varied very much. It is most natural to see in it a result deliberately courted by the Athenian commanders in order to strengthen the wings, and dictated by the nature of the ground (Leake) or by other considerations. Cp. Appendix X. § 37.

στρατόπεδον, 'army.' Cp. 5. 113 *supra*.

13. **ὀλίγας**, the usual depth was *ἐπὶ ὀκτώ*. The centre on this occasion may have been thinned down to three or four. The extra number thus set free were not, we may suppose, massed on the wings, but brought up to the front in the centre, so as to lengthen the line of battle, the order of the Phylae remaining unbroken. Thus while the wings—perhaps three Phylae on the right and two Phylae with the Plataians on the left—were eight or more ranks deep, the five Phylae in the centre were, perhaps, only half as deep. But no account is made of light-armed men.

112. 1. **διετέτακτο**, the completion of

τὰ σφάγια ἐγίνετο καλά, ἐνθαῦτα ὡς ἀπείθησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι δρόμῳ ἵεντο ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους. ἦσαν δὲ στάδιοι οὐκ ἐλάσσονες τὸ μεταίχμιον αὐτῶν ἢ ὀκτώ. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὁρέοντες δρόμῳ ἐπιόντας παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς δεξόμενοι, μανίην τε τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι ἐπέφερον καὶ πάγχυ ὀλεθρίην, ὁρέοντες αὐτοὺς ὀλίγους καὶ τούτους δρόμῳ ἐπειγομένους, οὔτε ἵππου ὑπαρχούσης σφι οὔτε τοξευμάτων. ταῦτα μέν νυν οἱ βάρβαροι κατείκαζον· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐπείτε ἀθρόοι προσέμιξαν τοῖσι βαρβάροισι, ἐμάχοντο ἀξίως λόγου. πρῶτοι μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν δρόμῳ

---

the movement is marked by the preposition as well as by the tense. The neuter construction is noticeable. Cp. *πάντες ἐτετάχατο* 9. 33.

2. **τὰ σφάγια ἐγίνετο καλά**, not as at Plataia, 9. 36. There is no delay implied in *ἐγίνετο*.

ἀπείθησαν. Who gave the word of command? Probably Kallimachos. Cp. 7. 122 *ἀπείθη ὑπὸ Ξέρξεω*.

4. **τὸ μεταίχμιον**, c. 77 *supra*. Eight stades would be *millia passuum*.

6. **πάγχυ** Stein joins with *ἐπέφερον* on the strength of 8. 10 *πάγχυ σφι μανίην ἐπενείκαντες*, and understands it in the sense *haud dubie*. Cp. *πάγχυ . . ἤλπιζον* 4. 135 *supra*. (L. & S. take it with *ὀλεθρίην*, and the position of the words favours this.)

ὀλίγους is a relative term; the army numbered 10,000 at least, as we must suppose. Cp. Appendix X. §§ 25, 26.

7. **δρόμῳ**. What the pace was it is of course impossible to determine. That thousands of hoplites in full armour advanced the best part of a mile at a rapid run without breaking rank (*ἀθρόοι προσέμιξαν*) seems incredible (cp. H. Delbrück, *Die Perserkriege*, pp. 55 ff.), whatever single athletes after special training and practice might have accomplished. Yet this statement is apparently made thrice (ll. 3, 7, 10) in this chapter. A. Mommsen, *Heortologie* 211, suggests an explanation. Hdt. witnessed the festival on Boedromion 6, and was persuaded, or inferred, that *Βοηδρόμια πέμπειν* was a commemoration of this charge. The history is an inference from the rite. On the other hand, that a rapid advance was one of the characteristic memories of Marathon need not be doubted (cp. Appendix X. § 27), and *δρόμῳ* might, perhaps, as a military term, be simply opposed to *βάδην*, cp. 9. 57, and Arrian, *Anab.* 5. 16. 1 (Arrian's usual antitheton to *βάδην* is *σπουδῇ*, 3. 8, 1, 4. 23, 2, 5. 14, 1).

οὔτε ἵππου. If this means that the Athenians had absolutely no cavalry, it can hardly be reconciled with the existence of the Solonian *ἱππεῖς*, or *ἱππάδα τελοῦντες*, with the alleged supply of two horsemen from each Naukraria (cp. 5. 71 *supra*), and with general probabilities. In the time of Herodotus the *ἱππεῖς* were the joy and boast of Athens, immortalised on the Parthenon frieze, glorified on the stage. Cp. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aus Kydathen*, p. 24, and on the number of the cavalry, Rawlinson n. *ad l.*, *Ἀθ. πολ.* c. 24, Sandys' note. But even at the best of times the Athenian cavalry was not a very important arm of the service. In 511 B.C., 5. 63 *supra*, and again later (Thuc. 2. 22, 431 B.C.) Athens relied on Thessalian horsemen. But under the tyrannis the native cavalry had probably been discouraged, for political reasons. The conjectures ascribed to the barbarian might fairly be taken to imply that they on their part had cavalry present, but no mention is made of it in the action by Hdt. See Appendix X. § 7.

οὔτε τοξευμάτων. This want Athens supplied apparently before the battle of Plataia, see 9. 60.

10. **πρῶτοι μὲν γὰρ κτλ.** On the formula, cp. Introduction, p. civ.

The *Μηδικὴ ἐσθής* would comprise a tall cap (which the king alone wore upright, cp. L. & S. *sub v.* *τιάρα* and add Arrian, *Anab.* 3. 25, 3), and loose trousers (cp. 5. 94 *supra*, 7. 61), outlandish articles of apparel, which might legitimately shock the taste, but could not damp the courage, of the Hellenes. Van Herwerden brackets *καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ταύτην ἠσθημένους*.

The sentence **πρῶτοι δὲ . . ἀκοῦσαι** is

ἐς πολεμίους ἐχρήσαντο, πρῶτοι δὲ ἀνέσχοντο ἐσθῆτά τε Μηδικὴν
ὁρέοντες καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ταύτην ἠσθημένους· τέως δὲ ἦν τοῖσι
Ἕλλησι καὶ τὸ οὔνομα τὸ Μήδων φόβος ἀκοῦσαι. μαχομένων 113
δὲ ἐν τῷ Μαραθῶνι χρόνος ἐγίνετο πολλός, καὶ τὸ μὲν μέσον
τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἐνίκων οἱ βάρβαροι, τῇ Πέρσαι τε αὐτοὶ καὶ
Σάκαι ἐτετάχατο· κατὰ τοῦτο μὲν δὴ ἐνίκων οἱ βάρβαροι καὶ
ῥήξαντες ἐδίωκον ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν, τὸ δὲ κέρας ἑκάτερον ἐνίκων
Ἀθηναῖοί τε καὶ Πλαταιέες· νικῶντες δὲ τὸ μὲν τετραμμένον τῶν
βαρβάρων φεύγειν ἔων, τοῖσι δὲ τὸ μέσον ῥήξασι αὐτῶν συν-
αγαγόντες τὰ κέρεα ἀμφότερα ἐμάχοντο, καὶ ἐνίκων Ἀθηναῖοι.
φεύγουσι δὲ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι εἵποντο κόπτοντες, ἐς ὃ ἐς τὴν
θάλασσαν ἀπικόμενοι πῦρ τε αἴτεον καὶ ἐπελαμβάνοντο τῶν
νεῶν. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόνῳ ὁ πολέμαρχος δια- 114
φθείρεται, ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός, ἀπὸ δ' ἔθανε τῶν στρατηγῶν
Στησίλεως ὁ Θρασύλεω· τοῦτο δὲ Κυνέγειρος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος

---

described by Rawlinson (i.[3] p. 78) as "an indefensible statement," and admitted as evidence of an undue partiality towards the Athenians on the side of Hdt. Without denying the partiality, it may be suggested that this remark, or something like it, occurred in his Athenian sources, and is not to be put down to the historian in the first instance (cp. a converse case 5. 97). Rawlinson *l. c.* gives a list of the *instantiae contradictoriae*. Cp. Appendix X. § 4.

113. 2. **χρόνος πολλός**. The phrase must be taken as decisive, though vague. The Athenians had no notion of representing the battle of Marathon as a *πρόσκρουσμα βραχύ* (Plutarch, *Mor.* 862). See Appendix X. § 35.

3. **Πέρσαι καὶ Σάκαι**, the flower of the Asiatic army, posted, as was apparently usual with the Persians, in the centre (see Rawlinson, note *ad l.*), though a different arrangement was adopted by Mardonios at Plataia, 9. 31. The disposition of the forces was not impromptu or irregular. The battle is here represented as a pitched battle (*ἐτετάχατο*).

By 'Sakae' would have to be understood 'Scyths,' not European but Asiatic. See Appendix I. § 8. Cp. 7. 64, where Asiatic Sakae are reckoned among the foot-soldiers. At Thermopylae the picked troops are Medes, Kissians, and Persians, 7. 210, 211.

5. **μεσόγαιαν**, 'inland,' cp. 4. 100 *supra*. Not of course the *μεσόγαια* technically so-called, which was separated from *τὸ πεδίον* by Hymettos, and to reach which by the nearest way the flying Athenians would have had to pass between Pentelikos and the sea. The expression seems to imply that the Athenian front was to the sea. Cp. l. 9 *infra* and Appendix X. §§ 34, 35.

6. **τὸ μὲν τετραμμένον κτλ.** This manœuvre seems too intelligent and successful not to have been the result of design and preparation: the commanders, or at least Kallimachos, Miltiades, and perhaps others, were fully prepared for the event. Cp. Appendix X. § 37.

8. **τὰ κέρεα**, (β) omits *ἀμφότερα*, which is superfluous. For **αἴτεον** *infra* van Herwerden suggests *ἀγίνεον*.

114. 1. **ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόνῳ.** It has been asserted that the main incidents of the battle as described by Herodotus are just those which were depicted in the Poikile Stoa (Stein, note *ad l.*). The assertion is tempting, but hardly accurate: see Appendix X. § 28. All the passages in which this picture is mentioned in the ancient authorities are brought together by Overbeck, *Antiken Schriftquellen*, pp. 200 f., 210 (Leipzig 1868).

3. **Στησίλεως.** It is unfortunate that nothing more is known of him.

Κυνέγειρος, brother of Aischylos. Pliny, *N. H.* 35, 57, speaks of him as one of the *duces*, but from the silence of

*ἐνθαῦτα ἐπιλαμβανόμενος τῶν ἀφλάστων νεός, τὴν χεῖρα ἀπο-
κοπεὶς πελέκεϊ πίπτει, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων πολλοί τε καὶ*
115 *ὀνομαστοί. ἑπτὰ μὲν δὴ τῶν νεῶν ἐπεκράτησαν τρόπῳ τοιῷδε
Ἀθηναῖοι· τῇσι δὲ λοιπῇσι οἱ βάρβαροι ἐξανακρουσάμενοι, καὶ
ἀναλαβόντες ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἐν τῇ ἔλιπον τὰ ἐξ Ἐρετρίης ἀνδρά-
ποδα, περιέπλεον Σούνιον, βουλόμενοι φθῆναι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους
ἀπικόμενοι ἐς τὸ ἄστυ. αἰτίην δὲ ἔσχε ἐν Ἀθηναίοισι ἐξ
Ἀλκμεωνιδέων μηχανῆς αὐτοὺς ταῦτα ἐπινοηθῆναι· τούτους γὰρ
συνθεμένους τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ἀναδέξαι ἀσπίδα ἐοῦσι ἤδη ἐν τῇσι*
116 *νηυσί. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ περιέπλεον Σούνιον· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὡς ποδῶν*

Hdt. and the other authorities we may conclude that he was not one of the *Strategi*. His name might have suggested the dog in the Stoa: but cp. c. 116 *infra*.

4. **ἀφλάστων**. The plural is observable: cp. *Il.* 15. 717 *ἄφλαστον μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων*. A derivation is given by Eustathius, *παρὰ τὸ μὴ ῥᾳδίως φλᾶσθαι* (Stephanus, ed. Didot, 2679).

5. **πελέκεϊ**, presumably a *battle*-axe, or bill: if so, probably wielded by a Scyth (Saka): cp. 7. 65, 4. 5, though properly speaking the *πέλεκυς* seems not to have been a weapon of war, cp. 7. 135.

115. 1. **ἑπτά**. The ships had not been beached, c. 107. The number is probably historical: that only seven ships were taken is an argument for the hypothesis that a good part of the Persian forces were already on board. It would take some time to re-embark many thousands, nay tens of thousands, of men, to say nothing of horses, etc., supposing the whole undiminished forces of the barbarians had been on land, when the battle began. See Appendix X. §§ 34, 38. Cp. H. Droysen, *Die Perserkriege*, p. 65.

3. **νήσου**, Aigleia, c. 107 *supra*. They would have to round Kynosura and go a little northwards to reach it.

4. **περιέπλεον**, imperfect. Even if they went all night it would have taken them at least till the following day to reach Phaleron.

βουλόμενοι. The statement is presumably an inference from the movement itself.

5. **ἐξ Ἀλκμεωνιδέων μηχανῆς**. Cp. c. 121 *infra*.

7. **ἐοῦσι ἤδη ἐν τῇσι νηυσί**. If these words are true, and the course of operations hitherto has been correctly rendered by Hdt., it follows that the Persians did not begin to re-embark until after their defeat at Marathon, and that the shield-signal was not displayed until after their re-embarkation was accomplished. What object it could then have served it is difficult to imagine. But, if the re-embarkation of the host had already been begun, if, say, the cavalry had been re-shipped, and perhaps more; if the signal had been shown when a number of the Persians was aboard; we can more easily understand the circumstances which determined the Athenian attack, the need for the hasty return to Athens, the comparatively slight losses, and other points which are otherwise obscure. See further, Appendix X. § 8.

116. 1. **περιέπλεον**, as just above.

Ἀθηναῖοι δέ. Some would, however, have been left on the battle-field to guard the bodies and the spoil. Plutarch, *Arist.* 5, tells us that Aristeides [who could be trusted], with his Phyle, Akamantis, was detached for this service. (Perhaps some of the Plataians too remained.) The other nine tribes marched back to Athens, but not surely the same day. From Marathon to Athens would be a quick march of six to eight hours (26 miles). Plutarch, *Mor.* 350, has this: **Μιλτιάδης** *μὲν γὰρ ἄρας ἐς Μαραθῶνα τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ τὴν μάχην συνάψας ἧκεν εἰς ἄστυ μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς νενικηκώς*, *i.e.* the battle was fought the day after Miltiades left Athens; and he returned, it might seem, on the same day as the battle. Rawlinson misunderstands this passage, taking it to mean that Miltiades returned to Athens the day after the battle. Even so, they would have arrived, we may be sure, long before the Persian fleet rounded Sunion. The Athenian forces could not have quitted Marathon until the Strategi were sure

εἶχον τάχιστα ἐβοήθεον ἐς τὸ ἄστυ, καὶ ἔφθησάν τε ἀπικόμενοι πρὶν ἢ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἥκειν, καὶ ἐστρατοπεδεύσαντο ἀπιγμένοι ἐξ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἐν ἄλλῳ Ἡρακλείῳ τῷ ἐν Κυνοσάργεϊ. οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι τῇσι νηυσὶ ὑπεραιωρηθέντες Φαλήρου, τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ἐπίνειον τότε τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὑπὲρ τούτου ἀνοκωχεύσαντες τὰς νέας ἀπέπλεον ὀπίσω ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην.

117 *Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχῃ ἀπέθανον τῶν βαρβάρων κατὰ ἑξακισχιλίους καὶ τετρακοσίους ἄνδρας, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ἑκατὸν καὶ ἐνενήκοντα καὶ δύο. ἔπεσον μὲν ἀμφοτέρων τοσοῦτοι. συνήνεικε δὲ αὐτόθι θῶμα γενέσθαι τοιόνδε, Ἀθηναῖον ἄνδρα Ἐπίζηλον τὸν Κουφαγόρεω ἐν τῇ συστάσι μαχόμενόν τε καὶ ἄνδρα γινόμενον ἀγαθὸν τῶν ὀμμάτων στερηθῆναι οὔτε πληγέντα οὐδὲν τοῦ σώματος οὔτε βληθέντα, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ζόης διατελέειν ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου ἐόντα τυφλόν. λέγειν δὲ αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ πάθεος ἤκουσα τοιόνδε τινὰ λόγον, ἄνδρα οἱ δοκέειν ὁπλίτην ἀντιστῆναι*

---

that the Persians had abandoned the hope of forcing the way to Athens from that side. Hence when the troops did march homewards there may have been need for expedition (Duncker, *Abhandlungen*, p. 40). Cp. Appendix X. § 35.

2. **τάχιστα** *del.* Valckenaer.

4. **ἐν Μαραθῶνι**, c. 108 *supra*.

ἐν Κυνοσάργεϊ, 5. 63 *supra*. Pausanias, 1. 19, 3, mentions the Herakleion between the Olympieion, or rather the shrine and statue of Aphrodite *ἐν Κήποις*, and the Lykeion. E. Curtius places Kynosarges outside the Diomeian gate (*Stadtgesch. von Athen*, p. 21) on the skirts of Lykabettos. The exact position is uncertain: see Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments*, p. 216, where are also some suggestive remarks on the dog. (Was it not a totem?) To Herodotus the coincidence here noted is supernatural, cp. 9. 101. Was it from Kynosarges that the dog came into the picture in the Stoa? Cp. Appendix X. § 28, and c. 115 *supra*.

5. **ὑπεραιωρηθέντες Φαλήρου**, cp. *ὑπεραιωρέεσθαι* 4. 103. Here the word is metaphorical: 'on the high sea off Phaleron.'

6. **τότε**. At the time Hdt. is writing Peiraieus had long taken the place of Phaleron, cp. 8. 66, and 85.

ἀνοκωχεύσαντες with van Herwerden. *ἀνοκωχεύειν* (not to be confused with *ἀνακωκεύειν*) 'to stay.' Cp. 7. 36, 9. 13, and L. & S. *sub v.*

117. 1. **ἐν Μαραθῶνι** *del.* Valckenaer.

ἀπέθανον. These figures are miracles of moderation compared with later exaggerations (see Rawlinson, note *ad l.*), and have an authentic air, though the number of the barbarian dead is admittedly a round number (*κατά*). Among the dead Cicero names Hippias, *ad Att.* 9. 10, 3: nefarius Hippias, Pisistrati filius, qui in Marathonia pugna cecidit, arma contra patriam ferens. This might be an inference from the disappearance of Hippias from the scene, as nothing more is recorded of him: or an exaggeration of his slip on the sand (c. 107). Some tradition slew Datis: see next chapter. Cp. Appendix X. § 25.

4. **θῶμα**. There is nothing wildly improbable in the story of Epizelos. Authentic cases are on record of total or partial blindness, consequent on visions (cp. *Acta App.* 9. 1-9). It is for the biographer to record such cases, and for the psychologist to explain them. Aelian, *N. H.* 7. 38, says that Epizelos was depicted in the Poikile. The apparition which struck down his next comrade, according to the statement of Epizelos as reported to Hdt. (but not in the Poikile: cp. c. 114 *supra*) and here recorded by him, was of course a foe, and cannot have been taken for Marathon, Echetlos, Herakles, or Theseus, all of whom, with Athene, were represented in the Poikile as aiding the Athenians. Pausan. 1. 15.

9. **ἤκουσα**. It is a pity that Hdt.

μέγαν, τοῦ τὸ γένειον τὴν ἀσπίδα πᾶσαν σκιάζειν· τὸ δὲ φάσμα τοῦτο ἑωυτὸν μὲν παρεξελθεῖν, τὸν δὲ ἑωυτοῦ παραστάτην ἀποκτεῖναι. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ Ἐπίζηλον ἐπυθόμην λέγειν.

118 Δᾶτις δὲ πορευόμενος ἅμα τῷ στρατῷ ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἐν Μυκόνῳ, εἶδε ὄψιν ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ. καὶ ἥτις μὲν ἦν ἡ ὄψις, οὐ λέγεται· ὁ δέ, ὡς ἡμέρη τάχιστα ἐπέλαμψε, ζήτησιν ἐποιέετο τῶν νεῶν, εὑρὼν δὲ ἐν νηὶ Φοινίσσῃ ἄγαλμα Ἀπόλλωνος κεχρυσωμένον ἐπυνθάνετο ὁκόθεν σεσυλημένον εἴη, πυθόμενος δὲ ἐξ οὗ ἦν ἱροῦ, ἔπλεε τῇ ἑωυτοῦ νηὶ ἐς Δῆλον· καὶ ἀπίκατο γὰρ τηνικαῦτα οἱ Δήλιοι ὀπίσω ἐς τὴν νῆσον, κατατίθεταί τε ἐς τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἄγαλμα καὶ ἐντέλλεται τοῖσι Δηλίοισι ἀπαγαγεῖν τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐς Δήλιον τὸ Θηβαίων· τὸ δ' ἔστι ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ Χαλκίδος καταντίον. Δᾶτις μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐντειλάμενος ἀπέπλεε, τὸν δὲ ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον Δήλιοι οὐκ ἀπήγαγον, ἀλλά μιν δι' ἐτέων εἴκοσι Θηβαῖοι αὐτοὶ ἐκ θεοπροπίου ἐκομίσαντο ἐπὶ Δήλιον.

119 Τοὺς δὲ τῶν Ἐρετριέων ἀνδραποδισμένους Δᾶτίς τε καὶ Ἀρταφρένης, ὡς προσέσχον πρὸς τὴν Ἀσίην πλέοντες, ἀνήγαγον ἐς

---

has not specified his informant (cp. 4. 76 *supra*, 9. 16), and likewise the time and place of hearing. The specification, such as it is, seems introduced not to guarantee but to excuse or even to discredit the story. Cp. Introduction, § 22. The doubt, however, need only extend to the cause of the blindness. Cp. Appendix X. § 3.

118. 1. **Δᾶτις.** It is now the turn of Datis to dream. Ktesias indeed reports that Datis was slain at Marathon (*Fragments*, ed. Gilmore, § 49, ed. Baehr, 18). Cp. Appendix X. § 30. Artaphrenes certainly was not, 7. 74, and c. 119 *infra*.

2. **Μυκόνῳ**, a little N.E. of Delos.

3. **οὐ λέγεται**, an honesty or poverty in the tradition which is remarkable.

ζήτησιν ἐποιέετο, cp. *ἐποιέετο σπουδὴν πολλὴν ἐξευρεῖν*, c. 107 *supra*.

4. **ἄγαλμα Ἀπόλλωνος κεχρυσωμένον.** The substance was presumably wood, or bronze.

6. **ἀπίκατο**, plp. Cp. 6. 9 *supra*.

7. **ὀπίσω** from Tenos, c. 97 *supra*.

9. **Δήλιον τὸ Θηβαίων.** Delion in Boeotia is not opposite Chalkis, rather is it opposite Eretria: strictly speaking it is not opposite either, but opposite the coast between them, Thucyd. 4. 76, 4 *Δήλιον . . τὸ ἐν τῇ Ταναγραίᾳ πρὸς Εὔβοιαν τετραμμένον Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόν*. Hdt. can scarcely have written this passage after the Athenian disaster at Delion in 424 B.C. Cp. Thuc. 4. 89-101.

11. **εἴκοσι.** Therefore about 471/0 B.C. at a time when the power and prestige of Thebes were eclipsed (cp. B. V. Head, *Coinage of Boeotia*, p. 20).

The story of this statue suggests that the Persians were not quite idle during the two unexplained delays recorded above, cc. 102, 110.

Where Hdt. heard this story it is not easy to discover. Blakesley says "obviously from Delos." But would the Delians have confessed their wrongful detention of the statue? Is it certain that Datis bade them restore it? As certain, perhaps, as that his action was determined by a dream. The *θεοπρόπιον* was perhaps Delphic. Justice and piety may perhaps have been the whole motive of this transaction, but one would like to know more about it. In 470 B.C. Delphi, or the friends of Delphi, may have been thinking that it was time something was done to revive the power and prestige of Thebes, as a make-weight to the growing power of Athens, and the Delian symmachy.

119. 2. **Ἀσίην.** From Mykonos they would have retraced their course across the Icarian to Samos, cp. c. 95 *supra*. Whether they landed at Ephesos, or sailed with the fleet to Kypros and Phoenicia cannot be determined.

Σοῦσα. βασιλεὺς δὲ Δαρεῖος, πρὶν μὲν αἰχμαλώτους γενέσθαι τοὺς Ἐρετριέας, ἐνεῖχέ σφι δεινὸν χόλον, οἷα ἀρξάντων ἀδικίης προτέρων τῶν Ἐρετριέων· ἐπείτε δὲ εἶδέ σφεας ἀπαχθέντας παρ' ἑωυτὸν καὶ ἑωυτῷ ὑποχειρίους ἐόντας, ἐποίησε κακὸν ἄλλο οὐδέν, ἀλλά σφεας τῆς Κισσίης χώρης κατοίκισε ἐν σταθμῷ ἑωυτοῦ τῷ οὔνομά ἐστι Ἀρδέρικκα, ἀπὸ μὲν Σούσων δέκα καὶ διηκοσίους σταδίους ἀπέχοντι, τεσσεράκοντα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ φρέατος τὸ παρέχεται τριφασίας ἰδέας· καὶ γὰρ ἄσφαλτον καὶ ἅλας καὶ ἔλαιον ἀρύσσονται ἐξ αὐτοῦ τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· ἀντλέεται μὲν κηλωνηίῳ, ἀντὶ δὲ γαυλοῦ ἥμισυ ἀσκοῦ οἱ προσδέδεται· ὑποτύψας δὲ τούτῳ ἀντλέει καὶ ἔπειτα ἐγχέει ἐς δεξαμενήν· ἐκ δὲ ταύτης ἐς ἄλλο διαχεόμενον τράπεται τριφασίας ὁδούς. καὶ ἡ μὲν ἄσφαλτος καὶ οἱ ἅλες πήγνυνται παραυτίκα· τὸ δὲ ἔλαιον οἱ Πέρσαι καλέουσι τοῦτο ῥαδινάκην, ἔστι δὲ μέλαν καὶ ὀδμὴν παρεχόμενον βαρέαν. ἐνθαῦτα τοὺς Ἐρετριέας κατοίκισε βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος, οἳ καὶ μέχρι ἐμέο εἶχον τὴν χώρην ταύτην, φυλάσσοντες τὴν ἀρχαίην γλῶσσαν. τὰ μὲν δὴ περὶ Ἐρετριέας ἔσχε οὕτω.

Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ ἦκον ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας δισχίλιοι μετὰ τὴν 120

8. **Ἀρδέρικκα.** Arderikka in Kissia, 210 stades from Susa and 40 from an asphalt + salt + oil spring, should admit of identification. (Cp. Appendix XIII. § 6.) The most successful attempt to localise it is that of Sir H. Rawlinson, quoted in Rawlinson, *Hdt.* iii.[3] p. 496 n. Strabo, 747, places the Eretrians on the upper Tigris, which would contradict Hdt. Hdt. perhaps contradicts himself: at least he places an Arderikka on the Euphrates, in upper Babylonia, 1. 185. There may of course have been two places of the same name. Rawlinson believes that Apollonius of Tyana conversed in the first century of our era with the descendants of these very Eretrians, and so forth (Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* 1. 24 ff.), and Grote (iv. p. 50 n.), Rawlinson and others (apparently even Duncker, vii.[5] p. 118) believe that Hdt. visited the Eretrians at Arderikka and saw the well here described. The expression *οἳ καὶ μέχρι ἐμέο κτλ.* does not justify any such inference (cp. 4. 124, and Introduction, pp. liii., xcv.), and Hdt. might have smelt petroleum and learnt its Persian name without going to Arderikka. If the description of this well, the method of drawing, and so on, had been beyond Hdt.'s resources, short of autopsy, how much of his work would never have been written! For a description of a wonderful well which he really did see, cp. 4. 195 *supra*.

11. **γαυλοῦ.** Cp. c. 17. l. 5 *supra*.

15. **τὸ δὲ ἔλαιον.** Van Herwerden marks a lacuna which he would fill *συνάγουσι ἐν ἀγγείοις, τὸ οἱ Π. καλέουσι ῥ.* And just above after *ταύτης* he would read ἄλλο ἐς ἄλλο.

18. **γλῶσσαν,** *i.e.* Greek, but you might detect an Eretrian by his *rhotakismos* (Plato, *Kratyl.* 434 c). Cp. G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.*[2] § 228.

120. 1. **ἦκον,** before the arrival of the Persians, or the Athenians themselves, c. 116 *supra*, so that the latter found the Spartans there already. So Plato, *Menex.* 240, says that the Spartans arrived the day after the battle. They consequently left Sparta the day before the battle. If they left on the day after the full moon, *i.e.* on the 15th, the battle was fought on the 16th. Plutarch, *de Hdti. malig.* 26 (*Mor.* 861), gives 6th of Boedromion as the day of the battle. Boeckh (*Mondcyklen der Hellenen*, § 15) has shown that the day of the annual Commemoration is substituted in this passage for the actual day of the battle. If the battle was fought on what was, or should have been, the 16th of Meta-

πανσέληνον, ἔχοντες σπουδὴν πολλὴν καταλαβεῖν, οὕτω ὥστε τριταῖοι ἐκ Σπάρτης ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ. ὕστεροι δὲ ἀπικόμενοι τῆς συμβολῆς ἱμείροντο ὅμως θεήσασθαι τοὺς Μήδους· ἐλθόντες δὲ ἐς τὸν Μαραθῶνα ἐθεήσαντο. μετὰ δὲ αἰνέοντες Ἀθηναίους καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν ἀπαλλάσσοντο ὀπίσω.

121 Θῶμα δέ μοι καὶ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὸν λόγον Ἀλκμεωνίδας ἄν κοτε ἀναδέξαι Πέρσῃσι ἐκ συνθήματος ἀσπίδα, βουλομένους ὑπὸ βαρβάροισί τε εἶναι Ἀθηναίους καὶ ὑπὸ Ἱππίῃ· οἵτινες μᾶλλον ἢ ὁμοίως Καλλίῃ τῷ Φαινίππου, Ἱππονίκου δὲ πατρί, φαίνονται

---

geitnion this would be, according to our calendar, Sep. 11, 490 B.C. But it is not credible that a force of 2000 heavy-armed men accomplished the march in three days (and two nights). Isokrates allows them three days and three nights for the 1200 stades (*Panegyr.* 97), which would bring them to Athens *τεταρταῖοι*—a sufficiently wonderful performance. They might of course be 'in Attica' without being 'in Athens.' The battle then might have been on Boedr. 17 = Sep. 12. But we cannot be quite sure on what day the Athenians returned to the city, nor consequently on what day the battle was fought. Cp. Appendix X. § 27. On the distance see c. 106 *supra*.

3. **ὕστεροι δὲ ἀ. τ. σ.** That the Spartans were prepared to leave Athens to be destroyed, only feigning an excuse (c. 106), and then sent an army at a forced march, is unlikely. As the march, the arrival, and the visit to Marathon seem well attested, it follows that the religious excuse on this occasion was genuine. Who commanded the Lakedaimonians, and whether there were Peloponnesian supports to follow, we are left to conjecture. Cp. Appendix VII. § 11.

5. **ἐθεήσαντο.** They were therefore still unburied. The Medes (Persians) were said to have been buried, but Pausanias (1. 32, 5) could not find any tomb or monument. The true Persians by the way would not have thanked the Athenians for burial; a point upon which Hdt. was not quite accurately informed (1. 140), cp. c. 30 *supra*.

αἰνέοντες: ea est enim profecto jucunda laus, quae ab iis proficiscitur, qui ipsi in laude vixerunt, Cicero *ad Fam.* 15. 6, 1. The Athenians were not likely to forget this *αἶνος*, and the tribute to an achievement, all their own (*τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν*).

121. 1. **θῶμα**, c. 117 *supra*, 1. 93, etc.

οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὸν λόγον, c. 115 *supra*, cp. Introduction, § 22. On the Alkmaionidae and their family history cp. note to c. 125 *infra*. The logic of the historian is at fault in this passage. To prove that the Alkmaionidae were *μισοτύραννοι* he relates the connexion of the family with Kroisos, the first barbarian who reduced Hellenes to slavery, 1. 6, and with Kleisthenes tyrant of Sikyon, and conveniently forgets the connexion and alliance with Peisistratos himself, 1. 60. This excursus on the Alkmaionidae has been suspected. Most editors regard c. 122 as spurious. Blakesley goes so far as to reject cc. 121-124. This is too much or too little, for how explain the introduction of the sequel 125 ff.? How explain the special peculiarities of c. 122? The passage may well be an addition (by Hdt. himself), and in any case can have been no integral part of the Athenian tradition about the battle of Marathon. Cp. Appendix X. § 8.

Ἀλκμεωνίδας. In 490 B.C. the head of the family was a Megakles, who in that year won a Pythian victory, celebrated in the shortest of Pindar's Epinikia, *Pyth.* vii.

If the ode was composed immediately after the Pythian festival the absence of all reference to Marathon is intelligible. The *φθόνος* to which the house was exposed is indeed indicated, but that feeling might be the cause not the effect of this suspicion. If the ode were composed in 489 B.C. (as Stein says), its silence would confirm the evil report. Cp. Appendix X. § 12.

4. **Καλλίῃ κτλ.** The men here mentioned were members of the great house of the Kerykes. The pedigree and history may be found in Petersen, *Historia Gentium Attic.* pp. 34 ff. (1880). Cp. Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung*, i.[3] pp.

*μισοτύραννοι ἐόντες. Καλλίης τε γὰρ μοῦνος Ἀθηναίων ἁπάντων
ἐτόλμα, ὅκως Πεισίστρατος ἐκπέσοι ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνέων, τὰ χρήματα
αὐτοῦ κηρυσσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ δημοσίου ὠνέεσθαι, καὶ τἆλλα τὰ
ἔχθιστα ἐς αὐτὸν πάντα ἐμηχανᾶτο· [Καλλίεω δὲ τούτου ἄξιον* 122
*πολλαχοῦ μνήμην ἐστὶ πάντα τινὰ ἔχειν. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ τὰ
προλελεγμένα, ὡς ἀνὴρ ἄκρος ἐλευθερῶν τὴν πατρίδα· τοῦτο δὲ
τὰ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἐποίησε· ἵππῳ νικήσας, τεθρίππῳ δὲ δεύτερος
γενόμενος, Πύθια δὲ πρότερον ἀνελόμενος, ἐφανερώθη ἐς τοὺς
Ἕλληνας πάντας δαπάνῃσι μεγίστῃσι. τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἑωυ-
τοῦ θυγατέρας ἐούσας τρεῖς οἷός τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ
ἐγίνοντο γάμου ὡραῖαι, ἔδωκέ σφι δωρεὴν μεγαλοπρεπεστάτην
ἐκείνῃσί τε ἐχαρίσατο· ἐκ γὰρ πάντων τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἑκάστη
ἐθέλοι ἄνδρα ἑωυτῇ ἐκλέξασθαι, ἔδωκε τούτῳ τῷ ἀνδρί.] καὶ οἱ* 123

---

566 f. (1886). Dittenberger's 'mustergiltige Abhandlung' in *Hermes*, xx. pp. 1 ff. (1885), now holds the field, cp. Toepffer, *Attisch. Genealog.* pp. 80 ff. (1889). The Archon at the time of the battle of Marathon was a Phainippos. Cp. Clinton, *Fast. Hell. ad ann.* 490 B.C. In the time of Perikles (and Hdt.) the names of Kallias and Hipponikos were very prominent in Athens. About 448 B.C., or perhaps even after the Thirty Years' Truce, took place the abortive mission of Kallias, son of Hipponikos, to Susa (7. 151, cp. Duncker, *Abhandlungen*, pp. 87 ff.). His son Hipponikos was Strategos in 426 B.C., Thuc. 3. 91. It may be doubted whether our author here has a clear view of the family pedigree; but he gives the three names which occur most frequently and prominently in the family annals. Cp. Aristoph. *Birds* 282. The Kallias here specified must of course be sought among the contemporaries of Peisistratos. The allusion in any case is forced. Stein suggests that the *λόγος* which the historian is discrediting was a family tradition in the house of the Kerykes. There were anecdotes against the Kerykes themselves, Hesychius *sub v.* *Λακκόπλουτος* (alia testim. apud Petersen, p. 40), but we do not ascribe them to the Alkmaionids.

6. **ὅκως Π. ἐκπέσοι**, twice, cp. 1. 64. The two expulsions of Peisistratos have been reduced to one, by Beloch, *Rhein. Mus.* xlv. 469 ff. (1890), *Gr. Gesch.* i. 328 (1893). Beloch defends Hdt. 5. 95 for (1) the synchronism between Alkaios and Peisistratos, (2) the implicit denial of any Attic war with Lesbos before Peisistratos. In any case the Kerykes may have repossessed themselves of the land again after the expulsion of Hippias (5. 65 *supra*).

7. **δημοσίου**, *sc.* *δούλου*, or perhaps *κήρυκος*, for there were *κήρυκες* and Κήρυκες.

ὠνέεσθαι. The family were among the wealthiest in Athens. The *ἱπποτροφία* further attests it, c. 122. The fortune of Kallias *Λακκόπλουτος* was estimated at 200 talents. Hipponikos had 600 slaves in the silver mines (Xen. *de vect.* 4. 15). His wealth was proverbial (see cit. *apud* Petersen, p. 43). His son Kallias *tertius* had the reputation of running through the family fortunes (see further, Petersen, *op. cit.* p. 44). Two of the weddings in this family were specially celebrated: the marriage of Kallias Lakkoplutos with Elpinike daughter of Miltiades (Plutarch, *Kim.* 4, cp. Petersen, *op. c.* p. 41), and the marriage of Hipparete (granddaughter of that Kallias and daughter of the Strategos above mentioned) with Alkibiades (Plutarch, *Alk.* 8).

122. 1. **Καλλίεω . . ἀνδρί.** Schweighäuser and Baehr defended this chapter. There is certainly nothing in the matter to discredit its authenticity, and the phraseology, though harsh, can be paralleled out of Herodotus, with one, or perhaps two, exceptions. But (1) the passage fails in some of the best MSS. (the Medicean, Florentine, and three others), in fact in one family of MSS. (=*a*). (2) Plutarch (or the author of the *de Malig. Hdti.*) does not

Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ὁμοίως ἢ οὐδὲν ἧσσον τούτου ἦσαν μισοτύραννοι. θῶμα ὦν μοι καὶ οὐ προσίεμαι τὴν διαβολὴν τούτους γε ἀναδέξαι ἀσπίδα, οἵτινες ἔφευγόν τε τὸν πάντα χρόνον τοὺς τυράννους, ἐκ μηχανῆς τε τῆς τούτων ἐξέλιπον Πεισιστρατίδαι τὴν τυραννίδα, καὶ οὕτω τὰς Ἀθήνας οὗτοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐλευθερώσαντες πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἤ περ Ἁρμόδιός τε καὶ Ἀριστογείτων, ὡς ἐγὼ κρίνω. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐξηγρίωσαν τοὺς ὑπολοίπους Πεισιστρατιδέων Ἵππαρχον ἀποκτείναντες, οὐδέ τι μᾶλλον ἔπαυσαν [τοὺς λοιποὺς] τυραννεύοντας· Ἀλκμεωνίδαι δὲ ἐμφανέως ἠλευθέρωσαν, εἰ δὴ οὗτοί γε ἀληθέως ἦσαν οἱ τὴν Πυθίην ἀναπείσαντες προσημαίνειν Λακεδαιμονίοισι
124 *ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὥς μοι πρότερον δεδήλωται. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἴσως τι ἐπιμεμφόμενοι Ἀθηναίων τῷ δήμῳ προεδίδοσαν τὴν πατρίδα. οὐ μὲν ὦν ἦσάν σφεων ἄλλοι δοκιμώτεροι ἔν γε Ἀθηναίοισι ἄνδρες οὐδ' οἳ μᾶλλον ἐτετιμέατο. οὔτω οὐδὲ λόγος αἱρέει ἀνα-*

---

appear to have read it in his text (Stein). Cp. *op. cit.* c. 27. (3) The sense and grammar are complete without it: *καὶ οἱ Ἀλκ.* c. 123 *ad init.* answering to the last sentence of c. 121 *Καλλίης τε γὰρ κτλ.* (4) Though Herodotean in phraseology, the style is abrupt and harsh, from the very multiplication of Herodotean turns: *τοῦτο μὲν . . τοῦτο δὲ . . ἄξιον μνήμην ἔχειν . . ἄκρος . . ἀνελόμενος* . . *et al.* and also from usages which are not Herodotean, *e.g.* *τὰ προλελεγμένα . . δωρεὴν . . ἐφανερώθη.* (5) *ἐλευθερῶν* is an exaggeration, or not properly justified in the context. *σφι . . ἐκείνῃσί τε* is incorrect.

In the face of these arguments it can hardly be maintained that the passage is of Herodotean authorship. Nor is the forgery a clever one. Lucian would have written the passage better.

It does not therefore follow that the matters of fact mentioned are untrue. The Olympian victories are likely enough even without the authority of the Scholiast on Aristophanes. The wedding of the daughters would have had more verisimilitude if the names of the chosen bridegrooms had been added.

123. 2. **ὁμοίως κτλ.**, *i.e.* *ὁμοίως τούτῳ ἢ οὐδὲν ἧσσον τούτου*, 'just as much as, or even more than, this man.' Van Herwerden suggests *οἱ* <*ἄλλοι*> *Ἀλκ.*, a reading which might seem to involve Hdt. in the error of making Kallias an Alkmaionid.

3. **οὐ προσίεμαι**, cp. *οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι*, c. 121. The *λόγος* has become a *διαβολὴ* in the light of the 'misotyrannic' tradition of the Alkmaionids.

4. **ἔφευγον τ. π. χ.** Their first exile was due to the *ἄγος* 5. 71, and dated before the tyranny. The family had subsequently been on good terms with Peisistratos for a time, 1. 60. It might be argued that (*a*) a distinction is drawn between Peisistratos and 'the tyrants,' (*b*) the tyrants are regarded not as a series but as a clique or small dynasty (*δυναστεία ὀλίγων ἀνδρῶν* Thuc. 3. 62) of members of one family.

7. **ἐγώ.** Thucydides agrees in this judgment on its negative side, against the claims of Harmodios and Aristogeiton 6. 54, but makes little account of the services of the Alkmaionids. Cp. Appendix IX. §§ 3, 4.

9. **τοὺς λοιποὺς** *del.* Wesseling.

12. **ὥς μοι πρ. δεδήλωται**, 5. 63 *supra*. Such references imply a reading public.

124. 4. **ἐτετιμέατο.** The family had been held high in honour, but had also been in disgrace and banishment. Its members were not among those celebrated in connexion with Marathon, nor did that victory apparently do much for their renown. They or their partisans had probably attacked Miltiades unsuccessfully before (c. 104 *supra*), and almost certainly attacked him, but that successfully, shortly after (c. 136 *infra*). There was that in the past history and relations, in the present attitude of the clan, which might well have seemed to justify suspicions that, sooner than see a rival house of the Pediaei founding

δεχθῆναι ἔκ γε ἂν τούτων ἀσπίδα ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ λόγῳ. ἀνεδέχθη μὲν γὰρ ἀσπίς, καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστι ἄλλως εἰπεῖν· ἐγένετο γάρ· ὃς μέντοι ἦν ὁ ἀναδέξας, οὐκ ἔχω προσωτέρω εἰπεῖν τούτων.

Οἱ δὲ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ἦσαν μὲν καὶ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν λαμπροὶ ἐν 125 τῇσι Ἀθήνῃσι, ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀλκμέωνος καὶ αὖτις Μεγακλέος ἐγένοντο καὶ κάρτα λαμπροί. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκμέων ὁ Μεγακλέος τοῖσι ἐκ Σαρδίων Λυδοῖσι παρὰ Κροίσου ἀπικνεομένοισι ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι συμπρήκτωρ τε ἐγίνετο καὶ συνελάμβανε προθύμως, καί μιν Κροῖσος πυθόμενος τῶν Λυδῶν τῶν ἐς τὰ χρηστήρια φοιτεόντων ἑωυτὸν εὖ ποιέειν μεταπέμπεται ἐς Σάρδις, ἀπικόμενον δὲ δωρέεται χρυσῷ τὸν ἂν δύνηται τῷ ἑωυτοῦ σώματι ἐξενείκασθαι ἐσάπαξ. ὁ δὲ Ἀλκμέων πρὸς τὴν δωρεὴν ἐοῦσαν τοιαύτην τοιάδε ἐπιτηδεύσας προσέφερε· ἐνδὺς

---

a 'dynasty' at Athens, they would make a composition with less formidable rivals, or even with the foreign foe. Hdt.'s express judgment is largely discredited by the facts which he has himself preserved in regard to the relations of the Alkmaionidae to Kroisos, to Kleisthenes, to Peisistratos, to Delphi and to Sparta. If this passage is, indeed, his, it may confirm our distrust of his political judgment. Cp. Introduction, § 22.

λόγος αἱρέει, cp. 4. 127 *supra*. **ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ λόγῳ** comes in somewhat awkwardly; Hdt.'s logic being at fault here may have corrupted his rhetoric.

6. **ἐγένετο γάρ.** H. Delbrück (*Die Perserkriege*, pp. 59 ff.) has proposed to cancel the whole shield episode: but it appears as one of the most positively attested incidents of the Marathonian campaign. It must fairly be utilised in any attempted reconstruction or rationalisation of the whole story. See Appendix X. §§ 8, 34.

7. **ὁ ἀναδέξας.** To have ascribed the act of treachery to one of the relations or partisans of the Peisistratids still in Athens would surely have been very obvious, if the case against 'the Alkmaionids' had not been very strong.

125. 1. **Ἀλκμεωνίδαι.** There follows here an excursus on the Alkmaionids, the occasion of which may perhaps be found in the relationship of Perikles (c. 131 *infra*) to the house. The proper representatives of the family in the time of Hdt. hardly sustained its old reputation, and perhaps owed their continued importance chiefly to their marriage connexions (through Agariste mother of Perikles, Dinomache wife of Kleinias, mother of Alkibiades, cp. 8. 17, Isodike, wife of Kimon). The sons of Alkmaion are less prominent in later story: the Euryptolemos son of Peisianax, who figures towards the close of the Peloponnesian war (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 4, 19 etc.), was a member of the family. Cp. Petersen, *Quaestiones* pp. 76 ff. The gold of Kroisos was not the beginning of the fortune of the family. Its members were already influential at Delphi (here, and cp. Plutarch, *Solon* 11, Ἀθ. πολ. c. 19), and already responsible for the Kylonian ἄγος 5. 71 *supra*. Relations between the Alkmaionids and the Mermnadae need be doubted as little as relations with Delphi, though their obvious significance is not realised by the story-teller, and the favours of Kroisos are made a comedy. The chronological data, however, are confused. On the remoter *origines* of the house, see Toepffer, *Attisch. Geneal.* 225 ff.

3. **Ἀλκμέων ὁ Μεγακλέος.** If Alkmaion assisted Lydian envoys at Delphi they were sent by Alyattes (cp. 1. 25) rather than by Kroisos, for the marriage of Megakles and Agariste took place before Kroisos ascended the throne, *circa* 560 B.C. Kleisthenes of Sikyon died *circa* 570 B.C. If any member of the house supported Kroisos it was Megakles. The *Marmor Parium* dates the mission of Kroisos to Delphi 556 B.C. But Kroisos may have sent more than once to Delphi surely.

7. **φοιτεόντων** = 'frequentium,' c. 137 *infra*. But cp. *ἐφοίτεον μνηστῆρες* c. 126 *infra*.

κιθῶνα μέγαν καὶ κόλπον βαθὺν καταλιπόμενος τοῦ κιθῶνος, κοθόρνους τε τοὺς εὕρισκε εὐρυτάτους ἐόντας ὑποδησάμενος, ἤιε ἐς τὸν θησαυρὸν ἐς τόν οἱ κατηγέοντο. ἐσπεσὼν δὲ ἐς σωρὸν ψήγματος πρῶτα μὲν παρέσαξε παρὰ τὰς κνήμας τοῦ χρυσοῦ ὅσον ἐχώρεον οἱ κόθορνοι, μετὰ δὲ τὸν κόλπον πάντα πλησάμενος [τοῦ χρυσοῦ] καὶ ἐς τὰς τρίχας τῆς κεφαλῆς διαπάσας τοῦ ψήγματος καὶ ἄλλο λαβὼν ἐς τὸ στόμα, ἐξήιε ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ ἕλκων μὲν μόγις τοὺς κοθόρνους, παντὶ δέ τεῳ οἰκὼς μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώπῳ· τοῦ τό τε στόμα ἐβέβυστο καὶ πάντα ἐξώγκωτο. ἰδόντα δὲ τὸν Κροῖσον γέλως ἐσῆλθε, καί οἱ πάντα τε ἐκεῖνα διδοῖ καὶ πρὸς ἕτερα δωρέεται οὐκ ἐλάσσω ἐκείνων. οὕτω μὲν ἐπλούτησε ἡ οἰκίη αὕτη μεγάλως, καὶ ὁ Ἀλκμέων οὗτος οὕτω τεθριπποτροφήσας Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀναιρέεται.

126 *μετὰ δὲ γενεῇ δευτέρῃ ὕστερον Κλεισθένης αὐτὴν ὁ Σικυώνιος τύραννος ἐξήειρε, ὥστε πολλῷ ὀνομαστοτέρην γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἢ πρότερον ἦν. Κλεισθένεϊ γὰρ τῷ Ἀριστωνύμου τοῦ Μύρωνος τοῦ Ἀνδρέω γίνεται θυγάτηρ τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Ἀγαρίστη. ταύτην ἠθέλησε, Ἑλλήνων ἁπάντων ἐξευρὼν τὸν ἄριστον, τούτῳ γυναῖκα προσθεῖναι. Ὀλυμπίων ὦν ἐόντων καὶ νικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖσι*

---

16. **διαπάσας** from *διαπάσσω*.

τοῦ χρυσοῦ *secl.* Stein.

19. **ἀνθρώπῳ.** The word is carefully chosen (not *ἀνδρί*).

τοῦ κτλ.: 'with his mouth stuffed full and his whole person swelled out.' Was not this story a subject of pictorial representation, or *genre*-work of one kind or another?

21. **ἕτερα . . ἐκείνων**, Stein reads on the authority of the better codices; but the better reading is supplied by *β*: *ἑτέροισί μιν δωρέεται οὐκ ἐλάσσοσι.* But cp. Schweighäuser, *Lexicon, sub v. δωρέεσθαι.*

23. **τεθριπποτροφήσας.** As Blakesley ingeniously shows (note 281 *ad l.*) this Olympian victory was only with a *pair*. Cp. Pindar, *Pyth.* 7. 13. Isokrates, *de Big.* 351, and cp. Rawlinson, iii.[3] p. 500, n.[6]

126. 1. **γενεῇ δευτέρῃ ὕστερον** involves a blunder somewhere. The wedding of Agariste must have taken place before the accession of Kroisos. See preceding chapter. The explanation of the blunder may be that the friendship of Alyattes and Alkmaion (*πρώτη γενεή*) was succeeded by the wedding of Megakles and Agariste (*δευτέρη γενεή*), but the substitution of the name of Kroisos for Alyattes above has involved the anachronism here: the former and the latter story being from different sources.

2. **Κλεισθένης ὁ Σικυώνιος** (5. 67 *supra*) died before the accession of Kroisos. **τύραννος** *del.* Kallenberg.

4. **γάρ.** Grote regards this story as (mainly) a fiction invented on Epic lines, suggested by the wooing of Helena, *et sim.* (vol. ii. 415 n.). Whether Hdt. or his source ('some ingenious Athenian') is accountable Grote does not clearly say. Stein suggests that the story comes from a Pindaric poem. Cp. Kirchhoff, *Entstehungszeit*, p. 43. If the poem was an Epinikion (cp. *Pyth.* 7), to judge by the existing samples the *mythos* must have been very freely articulated and transformed by Herodotus. Points in the story indicate an Italiote source, or at least an Italiote interest (cp. Zühlke, *De Agaristes nuptiis*, pp. 30 ff.) which would be sufficiently accounted for, if the story was first coined or circulated about the date of the founding of Thurii.

5. **θυγάτηρ.** Busolt (i. 494, i.[2] 666) thinks Kleisthenes had no son.

7. **Ὀλυμπίων.** The date of this Olympiad cannot be exactly determined.

τεθρίππῳ ὁ Κλεισθένης κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο, ὅστις Ἑλλήνων ἑωυτὸν ἀξιοῖ Κλεισθένεος γαμβρὸν γενέσθαι, ἥκειν ἐς ἑξηκοστὴν ἡμέρην ἢ καὶ πρότερον ἐς Σικυῶνα, ὡς κυρώσοντος Κλεισθένεος τὸν γάμον ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἑξηκοστῆς ἀρξαμένου ἡμέρης. ἐνθαῦτα Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι σφίσι τε αὐτοῖσι ἦσαν καὶ πάτρῃ ἐξωγκωμένοι, ἐφοίτεον μνηστῆρες· τοῖσι Κλεισθένης καὶ δρόμον καὶ παλαίστρην ποιησάμενος ἐπ' αὐτῷ τούτῳ εἶχε. ἀπὸ μὲν δὴ 127
Ἰταλίης ἦλθε Σμινδυρίδης ὁ Ἱπποκράτεος Συβαρίτης, ὃς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ χλιδῆς εἷς ἀνὴρ ἀπίκετο (ἡ δὲ Σύβαρις ἤκμαζε τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον μάλιστα), καὶ Σιρίτης Δάμασος Ἀμύριος τοῦ σοφοῦ λεγομένου παῖς. οὗτοι μὲν ἀπὸ Ἰταλίης ἦλθον, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ κόλπου τοῦ Ἰονίου Ἀμφίμνηστος Ἐπιστρόφου Ἐπιδάμνιος· οὗτος δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου. Αἰτωλὸς δὲ ἦλθε Τιτόρμου τοῦ ὑπερφύντος τε Ἕλληνας ἰσχύι καὶ φυγόντος ἀνθρώπους ἐς τὰς ἐσχατιὰς τῆς Αἰτωλίδος χώρης, τούτου τοῦ Τιτόρμου ἀδελφεὸς Μάλης. ἀπὸ δὲ Πελοποννήσου Φείδωνος τοῦ Ἀργείων τυράννου

. It has been dated 576 B.C. and 572 B.C. (cp. Baehr, note *ad l.*, Zühlke, *op. cit.* p. 16), *i.e.* Ol. 51 or 52.

8. **ἐποιήσατο**, middle voice. Cp. l. 14 *infra*.

11. **ἐνιαυτῷ**. The date fixed for the wedding would have been about September 575 B.C. (571 B.C.). The suitors were to assemble 'within sixty days.' Cp. 4. 98 *supra*.

12. **ἐξωγκωμένοι** used in a literal sense c. 125 *supra*, and here rather clumsily repeated.

13. **δρόμος**. In 8. 74, if genuine, with a different sense. Anyway cp. c. 112 *supra*.

14. **ἐπ' αὐτῷ τούτῳ**, 'on purpose.' **ποιησάμενος**, cp. *ἐποιήσατο supra*.

127. 2. **ἦλθε**. The list of candidates —if the Argive were omitted, see *infra* —would give just twelve suitors from various parts of the Hellenic world: from Peloponnese three, from the western main (Aitolia, Epidamnos, Molossi) three, from Italy two, from Athens two, from Thessaly one, from Euboea one. Corinth and Thebes are conspicuous by their absence, to say nothing of Sparta. The Ionians of Asia are unrepresented. The synchronisms are peculiar: the *floruit* of Sikyon under Kleisthenes (of Argos under Pheidon), of Sybaris and of Eretria each and all coincide, cp. c. 21 *supra*. See further the notes on the particular names.

3. **ἡ δὲ Σύβαρις ἤκμαζε**. The acme of Sybaris might coincide with the revival of the Achaian and Ionian elements in the Peloponnese; and there would be a special suitability in the Achaian towns of Italy sending representatives to Sikyon. Kroton, however, is not represented: perhaps naturally enough. Cp. c. 21 *supra*. Athenaeus xii. 541 preserves a (fictitious) embellishment to the effect that Smindyrides took a thousand fowlers and a thousand cooks with him on this occasion. Anecdotes illustrative of the luxury of Sybaris were afterwards attached to his name. (See Rawlinson, note *ad l.*, Zühlke, *op. c.* p. 17.)

4. **Ἀμύριος τ. σ.**, 'Amyris the sage.' An Amyris is mentioned by Athenaeus xii. 520 (if the reading be correct) as a legate of the Sybarites to Delphi. Suidas (*Ἄμυρις μαίνεται*) says that Amyris alone understood the oracle foretelling the fall of Sybaris, sold all his property, and went to Peloponnesos. The Sybarites thought him mad. Afterwards (on the destruction of the city?) he was much admired. This would bring Amyris down to the close of the century. On Siris cp. 8. 62.

7. **Τιτόρμου**. Later legend (Aelian, *V. H.* xii. 22) makes Titormos contemporary with Milon of Krotona: it cannot be said that Hdt. commits this anachronism, if it be an anachronism.

παῖς Λεωκήδης, Φείδωνος δὲ τοῦ τὰ μέτρα ποιήσαντος Πελο-ποννησίοισι καὶ ὑβρίσαντος μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων πάντων, ὃς ἐξαναστήσας τοὺς Ἠλείων ἀγωνοθέτας αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ

---

11. **Λεωκήδης.** Müller, *Dorier*, i.[2] 104, identifies with Lakedas a proverbially effeminate Temenid of Argos (Plutarch, *Mor.* 89) and penultimate king: cp. Pausan. 2. 19, 2.

παῖς Φ. The appearance of a son of Pheidon among the suitors has been objected to on three grounds: (1) as an anachronism. Pheidon's date has been put approximately from one to two centuries before Kleisthenes, the Olympiad referred to below being taken for the 8th = 748 B.C., or the 28th = 668 B.C. Though some of the suitors were older than others (c. 128), none can have been so old as this! (2) The anti-Argive policy of Kleisthenes makes a suitor from *Argos* out of place (cp. 5. 67 *supra*). (3) A Dorian suitor spoils the otherwise non-Dorian complexion of the list. Even if the anachronism were avoidable the argument remains against believing that a son of the Dorian despot of Argos was among the suitors of Agariste; but neither anachronism nor improbability proves the unauthenticity of the passage. Van Herwerden drops *παῖς* with RSV (= β).

Φείδωνος δὲ τοῦ τὰ μέτρα ποιήσαντος Πελοποννησίοισι. Pheidon, 'who introduced a system of measures in the Peloponnesos,' was despot of Argos and extended his power to Olympia, can be none other than the greatest of the Temenid kings. It is to be observed that Hdt. ascribes to Pheidon only the 'measures'; Ephoros was the first to make him author of the 'Aiginetan' coinage. Cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i. 143. Rawlinson admits a blunder on Hdt.'s part, but accepts the theory of there having been two Pheidons, a theory invented to avoid the anachronism (by Müller, *Aigineticorum Liber*, p. 60). But at that rate we shall want three or four Pheidons: see following note.

Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* i. 216 n. (1893), suggests that the introduction of 'measures' may have been ascribed to Pheidon, because there was in Argos a measure called a *pheidon*, Pollux, 10. 179 (ed. Bekker, p. 448). Is it not much more probable that the measure was named after the man?

The plan of dropping the passage *Φείδωνος δὲ κτλ.* to save Hdt. from anachronism is a product of criticism *in extremis*; better at once rewrite the passage, *ἀπὸ δὲ Π. τοῦ Ἀργείου τ. παῖς Λ. Φείδωνος δὲ ἀπόγονος τοῦ κτλ.* But this too is desperate and unnecessary. If anything goes out, we must get rid of the whole passage from the first *Φείδωνος* down to *παῖς καὶ* and read *ἀπὸ δὲ Πελοποννήσου Ἀμίαντος κτλ.*, not in order that we may save Hdt. from anachronism, but that we may reduce the suitors to a dozen, and be rid of the Dorian. But what reason can be shown for curing Hdt. of *parapragmatism* (cp. 5. 45), or where would the process begin and end?

13. **αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε.** The determination of the Olympiad of Pheidon is undoubtedly one of the most fascinating problems in Greek chronology. Neither the evidence nor the argument can be here fully exhibited. It must suffice to say that (i) if the text of Hdt. be genuine, and the statement correct, Pheidon would have to be regarded as contemporary with Kleisthenes of Sikyon. His Olympiad would then fall into the sixth century. (Busolt has shown indeed that if Pheidon expelled the *Eleian* Agonothetae, as Hdt. asserts, the Olympiad of Pheidon would fall subsequently to Ol. 72 = 572 B.C., *Gr. Gesch.* i.[2] 612 n.) Some recent authorities (Trieber, Beloch) have declared for this date, and Beloch even brings Pheidon to the throne 585 B.C. (Busolt, *l. c.*). This date practically rests upon the authority of Hdt. and in this connexion that authority is almost worthless. One historical agreement might be adduced in its favour. If Pheidon belonged to the sixth century he might have been the first to coin money in Greece proper (so Ridgway, *Origin of Currency*, p. 215): but the evidence that Pheidon coined money is also practically worthless: (*a*) The *Marmor Parium*, which however dates Pheidon, and therefore his coinage, 895 B.C.; (*b*) (Ephoros *apud*) Strab. 376, who was probably the author of the combination originally. A combination is not necessarily wrong, but against this one, the motives for

ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε· τούτου τε δὴ παῖς καὶ Ἀμίαντος Λυκούργου Ἀρκὰς ἐκ Τραπεζοῦντος, καὶ Ἀζὴν ἐκ Παίου πόλιος Λαφάνης Εὐφο-

---

which are transparent (cp. Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[1] 145), may be set the great improbability of the synchronism of Pheidon = Kleisthenes (= Periandros), to say nothing of having to date the institution of the ἀγὼν by Pheidon intolerably late (cp. (iii) *infra*).

(ii) In contrast to the clear statement by Hdt. and the inferences to be based thereon, there is a still clearer statement by Pausanias 6. 22, 2, according to which the Olympiad of Pheidon is the 8th = 748 B.C. This date has been very generally accepted, even by critical historians, *e.g.* Clinton (*F. H. ad ann.*), Grote (ii. 237), Duncker (*Gesch. de Alterth.* v.[5] 547), Busolt (*Die Lakedaimonier*, i. 98 tentatively, *Gr. Gesch.* i.[1] 145 decidedly), Holm (*Gesch. Gr.* i. 244 = Engl. Tr. i. 213), and others. But unfortunately Pausanias has marred his own authority by making Pheidon co-operate with the Pisaei, or Pisatae, instead of allowing him (as does Hdt.) to be his own Agonothetes (Hellanodikes). There is no so great ὕβρις in putting in the Pisatae for the Eleians! Pausanias' statement plainly rests on combinations, and apparently again on Ephoros (who in this matter is already discredited), for Ephoros made Pheidon δέκατος ἀπὸ Τημένου. (Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 619, regards the 8th Ol. as a date excogitated subsequently to Ephoros, in connexion with the Argivo-Macedonian genealogies and legends. See further, (iv) *infra*.)

(iii) By an emendation of Pausanias (usually attributed to Weissenborn, but now by Busolt, i.[2] 611 n.[2], restored to our own Falconer) the 8th was converted into the 28th Olympiad = 668 B.C. This date is adopted by Curtius, *Gr. G.* i.[6] 215, as "the most probable hypothesis" (cp. p. 239 and the note on p. 660. Cp. Engl. Tr. i. 235). It is a curious coincidence, any way, that Ol. 28 was, according to tradition, celebrated by the Pisatae, not by the Eleians (cp. Clinton, *Fasti*, i. 190 *ad ann.*). It would be easy to understand the substitution of the Pisatae for Pheidon in tradition, all the more seeing that the Olympiad of Pheidon was an Anolympiad (Pausan. *l. c.*). It may be, indeed, that the exact figure of the Olympiad of Pheidon is unattainable (cp. Bury, *Nemean Odes of Pindar*, Appendix D, p. 256), but the Olympiad of Pheidon was certainly the 28th or *thereabouts*, reckoning the Olympiads according to the conventional Anagraphe. For Mr. Bury (*op. cit.*) has made it probable that not only did Pheidon celebrate an Olympiad, but that he was the historic founder of the Agon: his Olympiad was virtually the first (pan-Hellenic) celebration. This conclusion has an important bearing upon the approximate date: it is an argument against lowering the date, so as to make Pheidon contemporary with Kleisthenes of Sikyon. The ascertained date for the first Pythian (pan-Hellenic) celebration is 585 B.C. But the Olympian had been of a surety in full swing a long time before that. The historical perspective, the political situation in Peloponnesos so far as ascertainable, favours the fixture of the Olympiad of Pheidon about the middle of the seventh century. (This is likewise the mature judgment of Busolt, *Gr. G.* i.[2] 623.) For conventional purposes Ol. 28 is the most suitable as the Olympiad of Pheidon.

(iv) Some traditions tended to throw Pheidon back even before Ol. 8 and to make him contemporary with Lykurgos = Iphitos, or even earlier. These need not here be further discussed. Busolt in his masterly analysis of what may be called the *stratification* of traditions on this subject (*Gr. G.* i.[2] 612 ff.) has shown that these particular developments belong to the Macedonian period, and are connected with the Helleno-Herakleid legend of the Macedonian house (cp. 5. 22 *supra*). The ancient authorities may be found conveniently in Clinton, *Fasti*, i. Appendix I. See further, Grote, Part II. c. iv. vol. ii. p. 237, Ridgway, *Origin of Currency and Weight Standards*, pp. 211-215, Bury, *Nemean Odes of Pindar*, Appendix D. For further German literature, see Busolt, i.[2] 611 n.[2]

15. **Ἀζήν**, of Azania, a district in N.-W. of Arkadia, cp. Curtius, *Pelop.* i. 385: not a proper name as Lenormant (*La Grande-Grèce*, i. p. 282) takes it. The greater towns of Arkadia, Tegea,

ρίωνος τοῦ δεξαμένου τε, ὡς λόγος ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ λέγεται, τοὺς Διοσκούρους οἰκίοισι καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ξεινοδοκέοντος πάντας ἀνθρώπους, καὶ Ἠλεῖος Ὀνόμαστος Ἀγαίου. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἐξ αὐτῆς Πελοποννήσου ἦλθον, ἐκ δὲ Ἀθηνέων ἀπίκοντο Μεγακλέης τε ὁ Ἀλκμέωνος τούτου τοῦ παρὰ Κροῖσον ἀπικομένου, καὶ ἄλλος Ἱπποκλείδης Τισάνδρου, πλούτῳ καὶ εἴδεϊ προφέρων Ἀθηναίων. ἀπὸ δὲ Ἐρετρίης ἀνθεύσης τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Λυσανίης· οὗτος δὲ ἀπ' Εὐβοίης μοῦνος. ἐκ δὲ Θεσσαλίης ἦλθε τῶν Σκοπαδέων Διακτορίδης Κραννώνιος, ἐκ δὲ Μολοσσῶν
128 Ἄλκων. τοσοῦτοι μὲν ἐγένοντο οἱ μνηστῆρες. ἀπικομένων δὲ τούτων ἐς τὴν προειρημένην ἡμέρην, ὁ Κλεισθένης πρῶτα μὲν τὰς πάτρας τε αὐτῶν ἀνεπύθετο καὶ γένος ἑκάστου, μετὰ δὲ κατέχων ἐνιαυτὸν διεπειρᾶτο αὐτῶν τῆς τε ἀνδραγαθίης καὶ τῆς ὀργῆς καὶ παιδεύσιός τε καὶ τρόπου, καὶ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἰὼν ἐς συνουσίην καὶ συνάπασι, καὶ ἐς γυμνάσιά τε ἐξαγινέων ὅσοι ἦσαν αὐτῶν νεώτεροι, καὶ τό γε μέγιστον, ἐν τῇ συνεστίῃ διεπειρᾶτο· ὅσον γὰρ κατεῖχε χρόνον αὐτούς, τοῦτον πάντα ἐποίεε καὶ ἅμα ἐξείνιζε μεγαλοπρεπέως. καὶ δή κου μάλιστα τῶν μνηστήρων ἠρέσκοντο οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων ἀπιγμένοι, καὶ τούτων μᾶλλον Ἱπποκλείδης ὁ Τισάνδρου καὶ κατ' ἀνδραγαθίην ἐκρίνετο καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἀνέκαθεν
129 τοῖσι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Κυψελίδῃσι ἦν προσήκων. ὡς δὲ ἡ κυρίη ἐγένετο τῶν ἡμερέων τῆς τε κατακλίσιος τοῦ γάμου καὶ ἐκφάσιος

Mantinea, Orchomenos, are not represented.

16. **ὡς λόγος ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ λέγεται.** Hdt. does not believe this story, cp. 4. 173 *supra*. Four stadii from the city of Kleitor was a temple of the Dioskuri (Pausan. 8. 21, 4), and their figures appear on fifth-century coins (*J. H. S.* vii. 102, Immerwahr, *Kulte u. Mythen Arkad.* 229).

19. **Ἀθηνέων.** Megakles himself was the contemporary of Kroisos, c. 125 *supra*.

21. Hippokleides son of Tisandros was probably a Philaid. Cp. next chapter.

128. 3. **ἀνεπύθετο.** If an Epic poem was Hdt.'s main source for the story, probably Kleisthenes was represented as extracting from his visitors the information given just above in the text, c. 127. The subjects in which the suitors were tested (*ἀνδραγαθίη, ὀργή, παίδευσις, τρόπος*) are characteristic.

7. **συνεστίῃ.** A curious word, specially used in the sense of 'boon-companionship.' Stein suggests *ἐν τῇ συνιστίῃσι ἐπειρᾶτο* . . . Van Herwerden approves of *συνεστοῖ* ("R optime"): which Holder also adopts.

8. **πάντα.** St. suggests *πάντα τε ταῦτα*: van H. reads *πάντα ἐπιστίους* after Madvig.

9. **ἠρέσκοντο.** Whom they pleased is not stated; it would be pleasant to believe that Agariste herself was consulted! Van Herwerden after Bekker inserts *οἱ*.

10. **Ἱπποκλείδης.** Hippokleides son of Tisandros is related to the Kypselidae of Corinth. At Athens his father is plainly contemporary with Kypselos father of Miltiades the Philaid, c. 35 *supra*. The inference is certainly tempting that Tisandros was a Philaid, and that the Philaidae had connexion with the Kypselids. The Kypselids traced themselves back to Kaineus the Lapith, 5. 92 *supra*. Lysidike the mother of Philaios was counted a descendant of Kaineus. Cp. Petersen, *Hist. Gent. Attic.* iv.

129. 2. **κατακλίσιος.** Van Herwerden suggests *κλίσιος*.

αὐτοῦ Κλεισθένεος τὸν κρίνοι ἐκ πάντων, θύσας βοῦς ἑκατὸν ὁ Κλεισθένης εὐώχεε αὐτούς τε τοὺς μνηστῆρας καὶ Σικυωνίους πάντας. ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου ἐγίνοντο, οἱ μνηστῆρες ἔριν εἶχον ἀμφί τε μουσικῇ καὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἐς τὸ μέσον. προϊούσης δὲ τῆς πόσιος κατέχων πολλὸν τοὺς ἄλλους ὁ Ἱπποκλείδης ἐκέλευσέ οἱ τὸν αὐλητὴν αὐλῆσαι ἐμμελείην, πειθομένου δὲ τοῦ αὐλητέω ὀρχήσατο. καί κως ἑωυτῷ μὲν ἀρεστῶς ὀρχέετο, ὁ Κλεισθένης δὲ ὁρέων ὅλον τὸ πρῆγμα ὑπώπτευε. μετὰ δὲ ἐπισχὼν ὁ Ἱπποκλείδης χρόνον ἐκέλευσέ τινα τράπεζαν ἐσενεῖκαι, ἐσελθούσης δὲ τῆς τραπέζης πρῶτα μὲν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ὀρχήσατο Λακωνικὰ σχημάτια, μετὰ δὲ ἄλλα Ἀττικά, τὸ τρίτον δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐρείσας ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τοῖσι σκέλεσι ἐχειρονόμησε. Κλεισθένης δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ τὰ δεύτερα ὀρχεομένου, ἀποστυγέων γαμβρὸν ἄν οἱ ἔτι γενέσθαι Ἱπποκλείδεα διά τήν τε ὄρχησιν καὶ τὴν ἀναιδείην, κατεῖχε ἑωυτόν, οὐ βουλόμενος ἐκραγῆναι ἐς αὐτόν· ὡς δὲ εἶδε τοῖσι σκέλεσι χειρονομήσαντα, οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος εἶπε "ὦ παῖ Τισάνδρου, ἀπορχήσαό γε μὲν τὸν γάμον." ὁ δὲ Ἱπποκλείδης ὑπολαβὼν εἶπε "οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ." ἀπὸ τούτου 130
μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται, Κλεισθένης δὲ σιγὴν ποιησάμενος ἔλεξε ἐς μέσον τάδε. "ἄνδρες παιδὸς τῆς ἐμῆς μνηστῆρες, ἐγὼ καὶ πάντας ὑμέας ἐπαινέω καὶ πᾶσι ὑμῖν, εἰ οἷόν τε εἴη, χαριζοίμην ἄν, μήτ' ἕνα ὑμέων ἐξαίρετον ἀποκρίνων μήτε τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποδοκιμάζων. ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οἷά τέ ἐστι μιῆς πέρι παρθένου βουλεύοντα πᾶσι κατὰ νόον ποιέειν, τοῖσι μὲν ὑμέων ἀπελαυνομένοισι τοῦδε τοῦ γάμου τάλαντον ἀργυρίου ἑκάστῳ δωρεὴν δίδωμι τῆς ἀξιώσιος εἵνεκα τῆς ἐξ ἐμεῦ γῆμαι καὶ τῆς ἐξ οἴκου ἀποδημίης, τῷ δὲ

---

5. **ἔριν εἶχον.** Cp. Bekker, *Charikles*, 2nd Excursus to 6th scene. Ed. Göll, vol. ii. pp. 335 ff.

6. **τῷ λεγομένῳ ἐς τὸ μέσον.** Cp. 4. 97 *supra* *γνώμην . . ἐς μ. φέρω*, and c. 130 *infra*.

8. **ἐμμελείην.** A serious and unobjectionable strain: or the dance itself (cp. L. & S.). Blakesley seems to be hypercritical in seeing a special offence to Kleisthenes in this tragic step, in the light of 5. 67 *supra*. Perhaps any very good dancing by a Eupatrid would have been unseemly; too professional.

9. **ἑωυτῷ μὲν ἀρεστῶς**, cp. 4. 61 *supra* *βοῦς ἑωυτὸν ἐξέψει*.

12. **Λακωνικά.** Probably of a military kind, perhaps the *πυρρίχη*, while the *Ἀττικὰ* were more distinctly comic (the *κόρδαξ?*). On Greek dancing, see Guhl and Koner (E. T. pp. 272 ff.), *Dict. of Antiq.*, *sub v.* SALTATIO, and Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Gr. u. Röm.* c. xiii. (1890).

13. **ἄλλα**, 5. 32 *supra*.

20. **οὐ φροντὶς Ἱ.** An expression that became proverbial. The phrase is anapaestic, and was used by Hermippos, cp. Suidas, *s.v.*

130. 2. **ὀνομάζεται:** hinc igitur originem cepit istud proverbium, Baehr. Van H. condemns Stein's conjecture *νομίζεται*. With the story of Hippokleides may be compared the oriental fable of *The Dancing Peacock*: on which see Appendix XIV.

ποιησάμενος. Cp. c. 126 *supra*, etc.

8. **δωρεήν**, c. 122 *supra*. Here as in c. 125 of course in its proper sense.

Ἀλκμέωνος Μεγακλέι ἐγγυῶ παῖδα τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀγαρίστην νόμοισι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίων." φαμένου δὲ ἐγγυᾶσθαι Μεγακλέος ἐκεκύρωτο ὁ γάμος Κλεισθένεϊ.

131 Ἀμφὶ μὲν κρίσιος τῶν μνηστήρων τοσαῦτα ἐγένετο καὶ οὕτω Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ἐβώσθησαν ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα. τούτων δὲ συνοικησάντων γίνεται Κλεισθένης τε ὁ τὰς φυλὰς καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίην

How many talents the successful suitor received from the tyrant is unfortunately not stated.

10. **νόμοισι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίων.** It is not quite clear what were the marriage laws of the Athenians in the year 570 B.C. or thereabouts. The Solonian legislation may have been just enacted: but our knowledge of the domestic institutions of Athens is mainly for the fourth century, when much was ascribed to Solon which was of later institution, dating even after the Archonship of Eukleides. It is possible that at the date of the wedding of Agariste kinship through the mother was still strongly recognised at Athens (cp. c. 103 *supra*). M'Lennan even argues acutely that at Athens the system of female kinship regulated to some extent marriage after it had lost importance in regard to succession (*Studies in Ancient History*, New Ed. p. 223). It is remarkable that the name of Kleisthenes is transferred from the *μητροπάτωρ* to the *θυγατριδέος* (5. 67, *supra*, cp. next chapter). By the strict letter of the later law Kleisthenes himself would have been *νόθος*. (Cp. *Ἀθην. πολ.* cc. 26, 42, Aristot. *Pol.* 3. 5, 8, 1278ᵃ.) On the other hand it can hardly be doubted that the Solonian legislation tended in the direction of the *patria potestas*, and probably to some extent damnified the position of women at Athens. In that case, perhaps, Kleisthenes was making some concession, on his daughter's behalf, in conforming to the Attic marriage law of the day. He performs the *ἐγγύησις*, and he no doubt gave, with his daughter's hand, the indispensable dowry (*προίξ*). As, however, this speech is scarcely historic, but may be taken to represent Alkmaionid tradition about the middle of the fifth century B.C., the formula would necessarily suggest conformity to the growing strictness of the domestic institutions, though it practically proves that the strict law above cited cannot have been in force at the time of the wedding. Cp. Duncker, *Ein angebliches Gesetz des Perikles*, in his *Abhandlungen*, 1887. On Attic marriage and family law generally: Texts—Petitus, *Leges Atticae*, Liber sextus (Parisiis 1635), Meursius, *Themis Attica* (ap. Gronov. Thesaur. v. ed. 1699), Télfy, *Corpus Juris Attici*, Lib. ii. (1868). For further Literature cp. Hermann's *Lehrbuch*, II. i.[3] pp. 1, 2. See also Smith, *Dict. Antiq.* articles MATRIMONIUM in second and in third edd. (an interesting contrast).

11. **ἐκεκύρωτο ὁ γάμος.** N.B. the tense. Cp. 5. 78 *supra*. E. Hruza, *Die Ehebegründung nach attischem Recht* (1892), proves that the terms *ἐγγυᾶν*, *ἐγγυᾶσθαι* denote acts constituting a legitimate marriage-contract (§ 3), and argues, from their occurrence in this story, that they date back to Solon (*ib.* p. 44). Cp. further, *op. cit.* § 6. The *ἐγγύησις* is a contract between the father (or other *κύριος*) and the bridegroom: for the *γάμος* the presence of the bride is necessary. The *formulae* used by Kleisthenes and Megakles are observable.

131. 2. **ἐβώσθησαν**, 'the name of Alkmaion's sons was noised abroad wherever Hellenes inhabited.'

Ἑλλάς, c. 106 *supra*.

3. **Κλεισθένης**, 5. 69 *supra*. Did Kleisthenes die without issue? Cp. next note. Whether he was the elder of the two sons it is not easy to determine. The pedigree of the Alkmaionids as given by Rawlinson, note *ad l.*, is so far misleading as it exhibits Perikles, Alkibiades, *et al.* as members of the clan. The proper genealogy of Perikles would of course be reckoned *πατρόθεν*. Cp. c. 14 *supra*. He and his ancestors belonged to the family of the Buzygai, a priestly house, connected with Eleusis. See Petersen, *Historia gent. Attic.* pp. 131 ff., Toepffer, *Attisch. Geneal.* pp. 136 f. On Xanthippos see further c. 136 *infra*. That he was among the friends of Kleisthenes and the Alkmaionid party seems obvious. The birth

Ἀθηναίοισι καταστήσας, ἔχων τὸ οὔνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ μητροπάτορος τοῦ Σικυωνίου· οὗτός τε δὴ γίνεται Μεγακλέι καὶ Ἱπποκράτης, ἐκ δὲ Ἱπποκράτεος Μεγακλέης τε ἄλλος καὶ Ἀγαρίστη ἄλλη ἀπὸ τῆς Κλεισθένεος Ἀγαρίστης ἔχουσα τὸ οὔνομα· ἣ συνοικήσασά τε Ξανθίππῳ τῷ Ἀρίφρονος καὶ ἔγκυος ἐοῦσα εἶδε ὄψιν ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ, ἐδόκεε δὲ λέοντα τεκεῖν, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας τίκτει Περικλέα Ξανθίππῳ.

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐν Μαραθῶνι τρῶμα γενόμενον Μιλτιάδης, καὶ 132
πρότερον εὐδοκιμέων παρὰ Ἀθηναίοισι, τότε μᾶλλον αὔξετο. αἰτήσας δὲ νέας ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ στρατιήν τε καὶ χρήματα Ἀθηναίους, οὐ φράσας σφι ἐπ' ἣν ἐπιστρατεύσεται χώρην, ἀλλὰ φὰς αὐτοὺς καταπλουτιεῖν ἤν οἱ ἕπωνται· ἐπὶ γὰρ χώρην τοιαύτην δή τινα ἄξειν ὅθεν χρυσὸν εὐπετέως ἄφθονον οἴσονται· λέγων τοιαῦτα αἴτεε τὰς νέας. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ τούτοισι ἐπαερθέντες

---

of Perikles may be placed conjecturally about 493/2 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 245, ix. 3). This suits well enough with the date of his political *début* (Ἀθ. πολ. c. 27). That he was not the eldest son of Xanthippos may be inferred from the fact that he had a brother named Ariphron, after the grandfather. The forty years of Perikles' primacy (quadraginta annos praefuit Athenis, Cic. *de Orat.* 3. 138, cp. Plutarch, *Perik.* 16. 2 τεσσαράκοντα μὲν ἔτη πρωτεύων), which would put his first appearance back at least to 469 B.C. and his birth perhaps to 499 B.C., is artificial, exaggerated, and scarcely consistent with the indications in Plut. *Perik.* 7. If the first στρατηγία of Perikles is rightly dated to 462 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 247) it would support the later figure (493) as the date of his birth.

6. **Μεγακλέης.** This Megakles was certainly ostrakised, cp. Ἀθ. πολ. c. 22 ed. Sandys; but it seems unlikely that there was also a Megakles, son of Kleisthenes, who met the same fate.

8. **ὄψιν.** The curious view in regard to the lioness and her cub reported by Hdt. 3. 108 might help to explain the dream and its interpretation.

9. **λέοντα.** Stein quotes the oracular parody in Aristophanes, *Knights*, 1037 (424 B.C.). In this allusion to 'the Lion of the House of Xanthippos' who can fail to find a key to the prominence of the family stories of the Alkmaionids in the whole context before us? Perikles is nowhere else named by Hdt., and it is natural to suppose that special circumstances at the time when Hdt. was writing had emphasised the connexion of Perikles with the 'accursed' house (cp. 5. 70 f. *supra*); but it is difficult to imagine that Perikles was *dead* (429 B.C.) when this story was written. The whole passage, cc. 121-131, or 125-131, might very well be a παρενθήκη made after 432 B.C. and before 428 B.C.

132. 1. **μετά.** How long after, Hdt. does not specify. The expedition to Paros can scarcely have taken place before the spring of 489 B.C. See Appendix XI. § 2. Miltiades was still Strategos, or perhaps re-elected in 489 B.C. But this expedition is plainly a special commission. Cp. 5. 97 *supra* and note 4 *infra*.

τρῶμα. We should rather have expected νίκην, cp. 4. 160 *supra*.

3. **ἑβδομήκοντα.** The whole fleet of Athens at this time. Cp. c. 89 *supra*.

4. **Ἀθηναίους.** No doubt the *Ekklesia*, mediately or immediately. It is difficult to believe that Hdt. here gives us a full or correct account of the secret commission of Miltiades. What he represents as a freebooting adventure admits of being interpreted as a legitimate and well-designed act of policy. See Appendix XI. § 4. On his own showing the present would have been an appropriate place for a remark on the folly of the Athenians (cp. 1. 60, 5. 97), but something kept him from it: unless the words τούτοισι ἐπαερθέντες convey a censure; such exaltation usually preceding a fall, cp. 4. 130, 5. 91 *supra*.

133 παρέδοσαν. παραλαβὼν δὲ ὁ Μιλτιάδης τὴν στρατιὴν ἔπλεε ἐπὶ Πάρον, πρόφασιν ἔχων ὡς οἱ Πάριοι ὑπῆρξαν πρότεροι στρατευόμενοι τριήρεσι ἐς Μαραθῶνα ἅμα τῷ Πέρσῃ. τοῦτο μὲν δὴ πρόσχημα λόγων ἦν, ἀτάρ τινα καὶ ἔγκοτον εἶχε τοῖσι Παρίοισι διὰ Λυσαγόρεα τὸν Τισίεω, ἐόντα γένος Πάριον, διαβαλόντα μιν πρὸς Ὑδάρνεα τὸν Πέρσην. ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐπ' ἣν ἔπλεε ὁ Μιλτιάδης τῇ στρατιῇ ἐπολιόρκεε Παρίους κατειλημένους ἐντὸς τείχεος, καὶ ἐσπέμπων κήρυκα αἴτεε ἑκατὸν τάλαντα, φάς, ἤν μιν οὐ δῶσι, οὐκ ἀπαναστήσειν τὴν στρατιὴν πρὶν ἢ ἐξέλῃ σφέας. οἱ δὲ Πάριοι ὅκως μέν τι δώσουσι Μιλτιάδῃ ἀργύριον οὐδὲ διενοεῦντο, οἱ δὲ ὅκως διαφυλάξουσι τὴν πόλιν τοῦτο ἐμηχανῶντο, ἄλλα τε ἐπιφραζόμενοι καὶ τῇ μάλιστα ἔσκε ἑκάστοτε ἐπίμαχον τοῦ τείχεος, τοῦτο ἅμα νυκτὶ ἐξηείρετο διπλήσιον τοῦ
134 ἀρχαίου. ἐς μὲν δὴ τοσοῦτο τοῦ λόγου οἱ πάντες Ἕλληνες λέγουσι, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ αὐτοὶ Πάριοι γενέσθαι ὧδε λέγουσι. Μιλτιάδῃ ἀπορέοντι ἐλθεῖν ἐς λόγους αἰχμάλωτον γυναῖκα,

---

8. For **παρέδοσαν** Cobet suggests *ἔδοσαν*.

133. 2. **Πάρον** (cp. Smith, *Dict. Geogr. sub v.* and Bent, *Cyclades*, c. xv). Paros, once only second to Naxos among the Kyklades ("traces of a vast population in former ages"), doing a brisk trade in its choice marble (3. 57, 5. 62), on good terms with Miletos before the great revolt (5. 27, 28), regarded as the metropolis of Thasos (Thuc. 4. 104, 4), was never more flourishing than in the days of Miltiades, and still in the days of Hdt. was paying 16 T. tribute to Athens (cp. *C. I. A.* i. 234), "twice as much as Naxos, Andros, and other larger islands" (Bent, p. 372). Paros presumably had profited by the fall of Naxos, and had made good terms with the Persians. It is likely enough that the Parians had taken part in the Marathonian campaign. Athenian tradition afterwards represented them as unpatriotic time-servers (8. 67, 112). That Miltiades should have been angry with a Parian for reporting evil of him to Hydarnes, and should seek to avenge the insult on the whole community, is not very probable. Was the victor of Marathon, the hero of the Danube, so anxious to stand well with the Persians? Good political and military reasons can be found for the expedition to Paros. See Appendix XI. § 4.

πρότεροι. Stein suggests the addition *ἀδικίης*, cp. 4. 1 *supra*.

6. **Πέρσην.** How Lysagoras the Parian came into relations with Hydarnes is not stated. In regard to Hydarnes, it would perhaps be safe to infer that he was the commander of the Immortals, cp. 7. 83 and *passim*, but especially c. 135.

8. **ἑκατόν.** One hundred T. would have defrayed the expenses of the expedition, perhaps twice over. (Cp. Appendix XI. § 6.) Miltiades may have demanded gold, c. 132 *supra*, though Hdt. here thinks only of silver (even if with Krüger *ἀργύριον* is removed). It was just the amount which Sikyon had (according to Hdt.'s authorities) paid, not long before, to Argos for an offence, similar in kind, but surely less in degree, c. 92 *supra*.

134. 1. **οἱ πάντες Ἕλληνες.** It can hardly be supposed that more is meant by this expression than that Hdt. has not met with any variant or contrary tradition on the course of events so far. With what follows the case is different: he gives, for some reason or other, a local Parian tradition, and that tradition was at variance presumably with the 'pan-Hellenic' version. But it had local colour, it had a Delphic reference, it had a good moral in its favour. See further, Appendix XI. § 3. The local Parian tradition only includes cc. 134,

ἐοῦσαν μὲν Παρίην γένος, οὔνομα δέ οἱ εἶναι Τιμοῦν, εἶναι δὲ ὑποζάκορον τῶν χθονίων θεῶν· ταύτην ἐλθοῦσαν ἐς ὄψιν Μιλτιάδεω συμβουλεῦσαι, εἰ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιέεται Πάρον ἑλεῖν, τὰ ἂν αὐτὴ ὑποθῆται, ταῦτα ποιέειν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν μὲν ὑποθέσθαι, τὸν δὲ διερχόμενον ἐπὶ τὸν κολωνὸν τὸν πρὸ τῆς πόλιος ἐόντα ἕρκος θεσμοφόρου Δήμητρος ὑπερθορεῖν, οὐ δυνάμενον τὰς θύρας ἀνοῖξαι, ὑπερθορόντα δὲ ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὸ μέγαρον ὅ τι δὴ ποιήσοντα ἐντός, εἴτε κινήσοντά τι τῶν ἀκινήτων εἴτε ὅ τι δή κοτε πρήξοντα· πρὸς τῇσι θύρῃσί τε γενέσθαι καὶ πρόκατε φρίκης αὐτὸν ὑπελθούσης ὀπίσω τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἵεσθαι, καταθρώσκοντα δὲ τὴν αἱμασιὴν τὸν μηρὸν σπασθῆναι· οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν τὸ γόνυ προσπταῖσαι
λέγουσι. Μιλτιάδης μέν νυν φλαύρως ἔχων ἀπέπλεε ὀπίσω, 135
οὔτε χρήματα Ἀθηναίοισι ἄγων οὔτε Πάρον προσκτησάμενος, ἀλλὰ πολιορκήσας τε ἓξ καὶ εἴκοσι ἡμέρας καὶ δηιώσας τὴν νῆσον. Πάριοι δὲ πυθόμενοι ὡς ἡ ὑποζάκορος τῶν θεῶν Τιμὼ Μιλτιάδῃ κατηγήσατο, βουλόμενοί μιν ἀντὶ τούτων τιμωρήσασθαι, θεοπρόπους πέμπουσι ἐς Δελφούς, ὥς σφεας ἡσυχίη τῆς πολιορκίης ἔσχε· ἔπεμπον δὲ ἐπειρησομένους εἰ καταχρήσωνται τὴν ὑποζάκορον τῶν θεῶν τὴν ἐξηγησαμένην τοῖσι ἐχθροῖσι τῆς πατρίδος ἅλωσιν καὶ τὰ ἐς ἔρσενα γόνον ἄρρητα ἱρὰ ἐκφήνασαν

135, and perhaps not every statement in them.

5. **χθονίων θεῶν.** Here apparently restricted to Demeter and Persephone, cp. 7. 153. **ὑποζάκορον** might be a sort of sub-deacon, cp. L. & S. *sub v.* *ζάκορος*.

9. **θεσμοφόρου Δ.** Cp. c. 91 *supra*, 5. 16 *supra*. Mr. Bent saw "certain doubtful ruins" which were shown as the remains of the temple of Demeter, and had the Herodotean story (with some variants) from the lips of his Pariote cicerone, *op. cit.* pp. 381 f.

τὰς θύρας, the doors of the *ἕρκος*.

12. **τῇσι θύρῃσι**, the doors of the *μέγαρον*.

πρόκατε, 'forthwith.' Cp. 8. 65, 135.

14. **οἱ δέ.** A variant which should be local Parian, and accords better with the view that the injury was due to a jump and a sprain. The Athenian tradition held that the injury was to the thigh, and Hdt., believing this to be the fact, has apparently introduced it just above as the better Parian tradition. Cp. c. 136 *infra*. It would be easy to 'reconcile' the conflict of authorities. If Miltiades had been *wounded* in the thigh he would have been all the more likely to come to grief in jumping the enclosure wall: but this is saving the letter to spoil the spirit of the rival traditions.

135. 1. **φλαύρως ἔχων**, aegrotans. Cp. c. 94 *supra*.

ἀπέπλεε. Miltiades plainly raises the blockade solely in consequence of his accident, and without any further occasion. Moreover, the immediate reference to Delphi takes for granted the Hellenic loyalty, so to speak, of the Parians. That Paros would be still, at least nominally, subject to the great king is discreetly ignored. The twenty-six days look like hard fact. Cp. Appendix XI. §§ 2, 6.

8. **τὴν ὑποζάκορον.** In the previous chapter she was a prisoner in the hands of Miltiades, captured presumably in raiding the island (*δηιώσας τ. ν.*). But from the Response *infra*, it appears that Miltiades only captured a shade.

9. **ἄρρητα ἱρά.** Cp. *ἄρρητοι ἱρουργίαι* 5. 83. On the distinction between **ἐξηγησαμένην**, 'instructed,' and **ἐκφήνασαν**, 'exhibited,' see Blakesley *ad l.*

Μιλτιάδῃ. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οὐκ ἔα, φᾶσα οὐ Τιμοῦν εἶναι τὴν αἰτίην τούτων, ἀλλὰ δεῖν γὰρ Μιλτιάδεα τελευτᾶν μὴ εὖ, φανῆναί οἱ
136 *τῶν κακῶν κατηγεμόνα. Παρίοισι μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἡ Πυθίη ἔχρησε· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐκ Πάρου Μιλτιάδεα ἀπονοστήσαντα ἔσχον ἐν στόμασι οἵ τε ἄλλοι καὶ μάλιστα Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφρονος, ὃς θανάτου ὑπαγαγὼν ὑπὸ τὸν δῆμον Μιλτιάδεα ἐδίωκε τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἀπάτης εἵνεκεν. Μιλτιάδης δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν παρεὼν οὐκ ἀπελογέετο· ἦν γὰρ ἀδύνατος ὥστε σηπομένου τοῦ μηροῦ· προκειμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐν κλίνῃ ὑπεραπελογέοντο οἱ φίλοι, τῆς μάχης τε τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης πολλὰ ἐπιμεμνημένοι καὶ τὴν Λήμνου αἵρεσιν, ὡς ἑλὼν Λῆμνόν τε καὶ τισάμενος τοὺς Πελασγοὺς παρέδωκε Ἀθηναίοισι. προσγενομένου δὲ τοῦ δήμου αὐτῷ*

---

11. **δεῖν γάρ.** Cp. 4. 79 *supra*. And further, 7. 17 for a parallel or comment to the present case: *οὔτε ἐς τὸ μετέπειτα οὔτε ἐς τὸ παραυτίκα νῦν καταπροΐξεαι ἀποτράπων τὸ χρεὸν γενέσθαι.* To have punished the human agent after the event might be regarded as equivalent to attempting to prevent or avert its occurrence. On the formula, which here is adopted by, or from, Delphi, cp. Introduction, § 22, pp. cxii ff.

φανῆναι. Rawlinson renders "she was sent"; Macaulay, "she had appeared." Stein points out the true meaning, viz. that a *φάσμα*, apparition, in the shape of Timo, had misled Miltiades. Cp. 4. 15 (where Delphi endorses the credentials of a *φάσμα*) and cc. 69, 117 *supra* for other *φάσματα*. The subject is **κατηγεμόνα**, cp. *κατηγήσατο supra*. *ἡγεμονίς* is the proper feminine of *ἡγεμών*, but is not used of persons, while *ἡγεμόνη* is a divine title. (Cp. L. & S. *sub vv.*)

136. 2. **Ἀθηναῖοι.** Hdt. recurs here obviously to Athenian tradition: the Parians would be no authorities on the story of the trial.

3. **Ξάνθιππος.** We may infer from this passage that (1) Xanthippos was the accuser; (2) the impeachment was *ἀπατήσεως τοῦ δήμου*: cp. Meier and Schömann, *Der Attische Process*, p. 344. (It was a variety of the *γραφὴ προδοσίας*. At least such would have been its later title.) (3) The procedure was by an *εἰσαγγελία* (*ὑπὸ τὸν δῆμον*), cp. c. 104 *supra*, and the reference to Plato *infra*.

6. **σηπομένου**, cp. *σφακελίσαντός τε τοῦ μηροῦ καὶ σαπέντος infra*. How his limb should have mortified from a sprain (*σπασθῆναι* c. 134) it is not easy to understand, though the same difficulty does not attend the case of Kambyses (3. 66 *ἐσφακέλισέ τε τὸ ὀστέον καὶ ὁ μηρὸς . . ἐσάπη*), who was *wounded.* Hence the significance of the Scholion (quoted by Baehr, note to c. 134) to Aristid. p. 218, to the effect that Miltiades was wounded in the thigh by a dart, launched by an unseen hand, which struck him as he was besieging Paros. Cp. C. Nepos, c. 7 (= Ephoros) aeger erat vulneribus, quae in oppugnando oppido acceperat. Cp. Appendix XI. § 3.

7. **οἱ φίλοι.** It would be interesting to know their names. Cornelius Nepos has: verba pro eo fecit frater eius Tisagoras, c. 7. His brother *Stes*agoras predeceased him, c. 38 *supra*. The omission of his service at the Istros is noticeable (cp. 4. 137 *supra*). That, however, was not a direct service to Athens, and had besides already done duty on a similar occasion perhaps, cp. c. 104 *supra*. His acquisition of Lemnos might have been expected to have served also at the previous trial. It is just possible that the reference to it here is unhistorical, and introduced by Hdt. as a peg on which to hang the story of the Athenian acquisition of Lemnos. Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen*, p. 16, even suggests that it was, perhaps, Miltiades *Cypseli* who first acquired Lemnos (for Peisistratos), in which case the achievement can hardly have done duty at either trial of Miltiades *Cimonis*: but the suggestion is unverifiable.

κατὰ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ θανάτου, ζημιώσαντος δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀδικίην πεντήκοντα ταλάντοισι, Μιλτιάδης μὲν μετὰ ταῦτα σφακελίσαντός τε τοῦ μηροῦ καὶ σαπέντος τελευτᾷ, τὰ δὲ πεντήκοντα τάλαντα ἐξέτισε ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ Κίμων.

Λῆμνον δὲ Μιλτιάδης ὁ Κίμωνος ὧδε ἔσχε. Πελασγοὶ ἐπείτε 137
ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐξεβλήθησαν, εἴτε ὦν δὴ δικαίως εἴτε ἀδίκως· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα, ὅτι Ἑκαταῖος μὲν ὁ Ἡγησάνδρου ἔφησε ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι λέγων ἀδίκως· ἐπείτε γὰρ ἰδεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὴν χώρην, τὴν σφίσι αὐτοῖσι ὑπὸ τὸν Ὑμησσὸν ἐοῦσαν ἔδοσαν Πελασγοῖσι οἰκῆσαι μισθὸν τοῦ τείχεος τοῦ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολίν κοτε ἐληλαμένου, ταύτην ὡς ἰδεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐξεργασμένην εὖ, τὴν πρότερον εἶναι κακήν τε καὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἀξίην, λαβεῖν φθόνον τε καὶ ἵμερον τῆς γῆς, καὶ οὕτω ἐξελαύνειν αὐτοὺς οὐδεμίαν ἄλλην πρόφασιν προϊσχομένους τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, δικαίως ἐξελάσαι.

---

11. **κατὰ . . κατά.** In slightly different senses: the first suggesting a result, the second a cause. Or, the two might be covered by the accusative of *respect*. Cp. Kühner, *Ausführl. Gramm. d. Gr. Spr.* § 433, where this instance is not quoted.

12. **ταλάντοισι.** Grote, in a well-known passage (iv. pp. 53 ff., Pt. ii. c. xxxvi.), has argued that the γραφὴ must have been τιμητὸς and that the people, after the verdict of guilty, had no choice but to accept one of the alternatives. Meier and Schömann, *l. c. s.*, represent the γραφὴ προδοσίας as ἀτίμητος, regarding the death penalty as fixed, on the ground that προδοσία does not admit of degrees: but considering the way the Athenians classified homicide we may be sure they would have been able to discriminate high treason from treason felony! Plato, *Gorg.* 516, seems to suggest that Miltiades only escaped by the casting vote of the Prytanis, if, indeed, that reference be historic, or referable to this occasion. Hdt. does not say that Miltiades could not have paid the fine had he lived. On the payment, cp. Plutarch's *Kimon* 4, which explains where Kimon got the money. On the end of Miltiades, see further Appendix XI. § 6.

137. 1. **ἐπείτε.** Cp. 8. 44, 1. 57.

3. **οὐκ ἔχω.** A contrast to Hekataios, who determined the question against Athens. This notice would not have been a good advertisement for the Ionian's works at Athens, unless, indeed, there were some good men anxious to rake up old sins and do penance therefor: a form of patriotism which the Greeks do not seem to have cultivated much.

τὰ λεγόμενα includes written authority (Hekataios ἔφησε ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι λέγων) and oral tradition (ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἀθ. λέγουσι), if, indeed, the latter version was not also in writing. Cp. Introduction, § 20.

5. **ἐπείτε γὰρ . . Ἀθηναίους.** Practically a quotation from Hekataios, and, as Blakesley remarks, σφίσι αὐτοῖσι seems to show that Hekataios had the story from 'Pelasgian' (Lemnian ?) sources.

7. **κοτε.** The word can hardly be used with reference to the writer's own day. It might almost seem as if the wall had been built long before the grant of land was made. Anyway the κοτε here marks a different epoch to the words τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον *infra*. According to Strabo, 401 (Hekataios ?), these Pelasgi came into Attica from Boeotia, driven forth by the invading Boeotians. The wall is named τὸ Πελασγικὸν τεῖχος 5. 64 *supra*, but the better form was undoubtedly τὸ Πελαργικόν. Cp. Appendix IX. § 4.

11. **ὡς δὲ . . Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι.** Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen*, p. 8, argues that there was no genuine Attic tradition in regard to the Pelasgi in Attica, and that we have in Hdt. merely an Attic reply to the charge of Hekataios. If Pelasgi

κατοικημένους γὰρ τοὺς Πελασγοὺς ὑπὸ τῷ Ὑμησσῷ, ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμωμένους ἀδικέειν τάδε. φοιτᾶν γὰρ αἰεὶ τὰς σφετέρας θυγατέρας [τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας] ἐπ' ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐννεάκρουνον· οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον σφίσι κω οὐδὲ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἕλλησι οἰκέτας· ὅκως δὲ ἔλθοιεν αὗται, τοὺς Πελασγοὺς ὑπὸ ὕβριός τε καὶ ὀλιγωρίης βιᾶσθαί σφεας. καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι σφι οὐκ ἀποχρᾶν ποιέειν, ἀλλὰ τέλος καὶ ἐπιβουλεύοντας ἐπιχείρησιν φανῆναι ἐπ'

---

were never in Attica, they could not have built the wall round the Akropolis: who, then, did build it? Certainly it was built in primitive prae-Hellenic, or proto-Hellenic, *i.e.* 'Pelasgic,' times. The story of its building may be fabulous, and the comings and goings of the 'Pelasgi' are more or less pragmatic: but has Meyer shown that the Pelasgi should be reduced to the rank of a merely regulative idea? The last word on the Pelasgian question is not yet spoken: cp. Mr. Arthur Evans' forthcoming paper in *J. H. S.* 1895.

14. **Ἐννεάκρουνον.** There is an anachronism in calling the source by this name. The older name (to which the present has reverted) was Kallirrhoë. It was only in the days of Peisistratos that the spot was walled in and renamed, Thucyd. 2. 15, 5. In regard to its exact topographic position there has long raged a notorious controversy. Herodotus in this passage plainly implies that Kallirrhoë, or rather Enneakrunos, was outside the city (of old), and in the direction of Hymettos. As a general indication this site squares with the passage of Thucydides, where he is describing buildings and objects outside the old πόλις, which term is explained to mean *ἡ ἀκρόπολις καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον.* The archaic Kallirrhoë, the sources of Enneakrunos, must therefore be sought outside the ancient city, to the south of the Akropolis, in proximity to the Olympieion (*ἐγγὺς οὔσῃ* Thuc. *l. c.*). These indications place Kallirrhoë implicitly on or near the Ilissos, and so Plato, *Axioch.* 364 expressly *ἐξιόντι μοι ἐς Κυνόσαργες καὶ γενομένῳ μοι κατὰ τὸν Ἰλισσὸν . . Κλεινίαν ὁρῶ τὸν Ἀξιόχου θέοντα ἐπὶ Καλλιρρόην* . . . But Pausanias 1. 14, 1 mentions Enneakrunos in the neighbourhood of *an* Odeion (cp. 8. 6), apparently in his tour of the Agora, though in a passage riddled with literary digressions, and full of small topographical uncertainties. Hence an apparent conflict of authority between Pausanias on the one part and Thucydides *et al.* on the other: was Enneakrunos in the Agora, where Pausanias places it, or on the Ilissos, where Herodotus, Thucydides *et al.* place it? The following points are clear: there was a Kallirrhoë on the Ilissos, which Hdt. and Thuc. identify with Enneakrunos. There was a fountain (κρήνη) in the Agora, which Pausanias identifies with Enneakrunos. If there is any error here, it must be with Pausanias, not with Thucydides. The only possible reconciliation lies in the theory that there was a connexion between the springs on the Ilissos and the fountain in the Agora, a connexion established by Peisistratos, and that Thucydides is speaking of one end of the aqueduct, Pausanias of the other. Dr. Dörpfeld claims to have discovered the conduit *in situ*. See Harrison and Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments*, pp. 87-91, Curtius, *Stadtgeschichte*, pp. v, 87, etc., E. Gardner, in *J. H. S.* xiii. pp. 139 ff. (1893), xiv. pp. 224 ff. (1894). **τε . . παῖδας** *del.* Schaefer.

οὐ γὰρ . . οἰκέτας. In the Homeric poems slavery is an established institution. Does *τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον* refer to an age anterior to the Trojan war? Strabo (*l. c. supra*) dates it to the Boeotian invasion, *i.e.* after (60 years after, Thuc. 1. 12) the Trojan war. Hdt. 4. 145 supports the view that the expulsion of the Pelasgi took place after the Trojan war. There is then an anachronism in this Athenian tradition, which seems to imply that there were no slaves in Greece, nearly a century after the Trojan war. On the other hand the recognition of a period when slavery was not, and the association of that period with the 'Pelasgian' type, are significant points in Attic tradition. It is to be noticed that the antithesis between Athenian and Pelasgian is pronounced in both versions. Cp. 8. 44, 1. 57.

αὐτοφώρῳ. ἑωυτοὺς δὲ γενέσθαι τοσούτῳ ἐκείνων ἄνδρας ἀμείνονας, ὅσῳ, παρεὸν ἑωυτοῖσι ἀποκτεῖναι τοὺς Πελασγούς, ἐπεί σφεας ἔλαβον ἐπιβουλεύοντας, οὐκ ἐθελῆσαι, ἀλλά σφι προειπεῖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐξιέναι. τοὺς δὲ οὕτω δὴ ἐκχωρήσαντας ἄλλα τε σχεῖν χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Λῆμνον. ἐκεῖνα μὲν δὴ Ἑκαταῖος ἔλεξε, ταῦτα δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι.

138 οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ οὗτοι Λῆμνον τότε νεμόμενοι καὶ βουλόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τιμωρήσασθαι, εὖ τε ἐξεπιστάμενοι τὰς Ἀθηναίων ὁρτάς, πεντηκοντέρους κτησάμενοι ἐλόχησαν Ἀρτέμιδι ἐν Βραυρῶνι ἀγούσας ὁρτὴν τὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἁρπάσαντες τουτέων πολλὰς οἴχοντο ἀποπλέοντες, καί σφεας ἐς Λῆμνον ἀγαγόντες παλλακὰς εἶχον. ὡς δὲ τέκνων αὗται αἱ γυναῖκες ὑπεπλήσθησαν, γλῶσσάν τε τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ τρόπους

---

21. **ἀλλά.** Samothrake 2. 51, Imbros 5. 26, Plakia and Skylake 1. 57.

138. 1. **τότε.** Cp. 5. 26. The story which follows looks like a reminiscence of the customs of exogamy and marriage by capture misunderstood and transfigured in tradition. On its anthropological bearings, cp. M'Lennan's *Studies in Ancient History*, 'Primitive Marriage,' c. iv., Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, c. xvii. The suggestion that the *motiv* is obviously (*offenbar*) taken from the *saga* of Boreas and Oreithyia (Meyer, *Forschungen*, p. 9) seems hardly adequate.

3. **τὰς Ἀθηναίων ὁρτάς.** The number in Periklean Athens was legion. Cp. Xen. (?), *de Rep. Ath.* 3. 2, A. Mommsen, *Heortologie* (1864).

πεντηκοντέρους, open galleys. On the form of the word cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

4. **Ἀθηναίων.** The statement implies (1) the synoikism, and so probably an anachronism; (2) the antiquity of the (Athenian) cult of Artemis in Brauron. It is thus inconsistent with the Athenian legend, as found in Euripides, *Iphig. in Tauris*, 1435 ff., which identifies the image at Brauron with the Tauric Artemis, and represents it as brought there by Orestes. (The Brauronian rite was Arctic if not Tauric!) It was, indeed, a pre-Hellenic cult, and likely enough 'Pelasgian' property: the ritual involving a dance in bearskins. It was a rural festival, presumably instituted by a pastoral people: and if there were lions in Paionia in the days of Herodotus (7. 125) there may have been bears on Hymettos in 'Pelasgian' times. In Hdt.'s time, perhaps since the time of Peisistratos, the Brauronian goddess had a sanctuary on the Akropolis, the remains of which are still visible: and it was in the Akropolis that the Athenian girls were initiated; probably yearly on the 16th of Munychion. This may have been the date of the rural festival in Brauron, which at any rate would be a Spring festival and in the sea-faring season, and, perhaps annual: but in later times at least it was only a *πεντετηρίς*. (Perhaps already so in Hdt.'s day: hence *εὖ ἐξεπιστάμενοι τὰς Ἀθηναίων ὁρτὰς* with special significance.) Cp. A. Mommsen, *Heortologie*, pp. 403 ff.; Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments*, pp. 395 ff.; Lang, *Myth and Ritual*, ii. 212 ff. (With the ritual described, Eurip. *Iph. in Tauris*, 1458 ff., cp. the rite of the 'Shrove-Tide Bear,' Frazer, *Golden Bough*, i. 254.)

6. **παλλακάς.** The legend seems to suggest one frequent origin, at once of domestic slavery and of polygamy. For the rest, the fate of the Attic mothers and their sons of course justified the Athenian conquest of Lemnos; and the case is an instance of the political utility of myths and legends.

7. **γλῶσσαν τ. Ἀ.** On the language of the Pelasgi 1. 57. But that the women carried to Lemnos spake 'Attic,' looks anachronistic. The primitive Lemnian language may be represented in the celebrated prehistoric inscription most conveniently accessible in Dr. Carl Pauli's *Vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos*, Leipzig, 1886.

τοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἐδίδασκον τοὺς παῖδας. οἱ δὲ οὔτε συμμίσγεσθαι τοῖσι ἐκ τῶν Πελασγίδων γυναικῶν παισὶ ἤθελον, εἴ τε τύπτοιτό τις αὐτῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνων τινός, ἐβοήθεόν τε πάντες καὶ ἐτιμώρεον ἀλλήλοισι· καὶ δὴ καὶ ἄρχειν τε τῶν παίδων οἱ παῖδες ἐδικαίευν καὶ πολλῷ ἐπεκράτεον. μαθόντες δὲ ταῦτα οἱ Πελασγοὶ ἑωυτοῖσι λόγους ἐδίδοσαν· καί σφι βουλευομένοισι δεινόν τι ἐσέδυνε, εἰ δὴ διαγινώσκοιεν σφίσι τε βοηθέειν οἱ παῖδες πρὸς τῶν κουριδιέων γυναικῶν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τούτων αὐτίκα ἄρχειν πειρῴατο, τί δὴ ἀνδρωθέντες δῆθεν ποιήσουσι. ἐνθαῦτα ἔδοξέ σφι κτείνειν τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀττικέων γυναικῶν. ποιεῦσι δὴ ταῦτα, προσαπολλύουσι δέ σφεων καὶ τὰς μητέρας. ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τοῦ προτέρου τούτων, τὸ ἐργάσαντο αἱ γυναῖκες τοὺς ἅμα Θόαντι ἄνδρας σφετέρους ἀποκτείνασαι, νενόμισται ἀνὰ τὴν

139 Ἑλλάδα τὰ σχέτλια ἔργα πάντα Λήμνια καλέεσθαι. ἀποκτείνασι δὲ τοῖσι Πελασγοῖσι τοὺς σφετέρους παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας οὔτε γῆ καρπὸν ἔφερε οὔτε γυναῖκές τε καὶ ποῖμναι ὁμοίως ἔτικτον καὶ πρὸ τοῦ. πιεζόμενοι δὲ λιμῷ καὶ ἀπαιδίῃ ἐς Δελφοὺς ἔπεμπον λύσιν τινὰ αἰτησόμενοι τῶν παρεόντων κακῶν. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφέας ἐκέλευε Ἀθηναίοισι δίκας διδόναι ταύτας τὰς ἂν αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι δικάσωσι. ἦλθόν τε δὴ ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας οἱ Πελασγοὶ καὶ δίκας ἐπαγγέλλοντο βουλόμενοι διδόναι παντὸς τοῦ ἀδικήματος. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐν τῷ πρυτανηίῳ κλίνην στρώσαντες ὡς εἶχον κάλλιστα καὶ τράπεζαν ἐπιπλέην ἀγαθῶν πάντων παραθέντες, ἐκέλευον τοὺς Πελασγοὺς τὴν χώρην σφίσι παραδιδόναι οὕτω ἔχουσαν. οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ ὑπολαβόντες εἶπαν "ἐπεὰν βορέῃ ἀνέμῳ αὐτημερὸν ἐξανύσῃ νηῦς ἐκ τῆς ὑμετέρης ἐς τὴν ἡμετέρην, τότε παραδώσομεν,"

---

20. **ἅμα** seems to imply that Thoas shared the common fate. Rawlinson, indeed, translates: "in the days of Thoas," perhaps to reconcile Hdt. with the ordinary tradition, according to which Thoas was saved by his daughter Hypsipyle. Cp. Apoll. 1. 9, 17. Thoas did not finally escape (Apoll. 3. 6, 4).

21. **Λήμνια.** Blakesley *ad l.* suggests another origin of the phrase: *Λῆμνος* was a name of the *μεγάλη θεός*, to whom virgins were sacrificed, so Steph. Byz. *sub v.* "apparently following Hekataios." Is Hdt. here then consciously correcting the derivation given by Hekataios? On **Ἑλλάς**, cp. c. 106. l. 8 *supra.*

139. 4. **λιμῷ.** Drought and famine were common signs of divine displeasure. Cp. 4. 151, 5. 82 *supra.*

ἔπεμπον. A theoria from 'Pelasgic' Lemnos to Delphi, and a Delphic response so much to the advantage of Athens, are suggestive traditions. The whole story is presumably from Athenian sources. The oracle had not been fulfilled—perhaps not even recorded—when Hekataios wrote the passage quoted c. 137 *supra.* The divine behest: *Ἀθηναίοισι δίκας διδόναι ταύτας τὰς ἂν αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι δικάσωσι* providentially anticipates the practice of imperial Athens towards her Symmachy. The phraseology and even the argument in this story smack of Attic jurisprudence: cp. *ἐπιβουλεύοντας . . ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ* c. 137 *supra*, and its legal consequence. Political claims are also insinuated, *e.g.* *ἄρχειν* (*bis*) c. 138 *supra.*

ἐπιστάμενοι τοῦτο εἶναι ἀδύνατον γενέσθαι. ἡ γὰρ Ἀττικὴ πρὸς νότον κέεται πολλὸν τῆς Λήμνου. τότε μὲν τοιαῦτα· ἔτεσι δὲ 140
κάρτα πολλοῖσι ὕστερον τούτων, ὡς ἡ Χερσόνησος ἡ ἐπ' Ἑλλησπόντῳ ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίοισι, Μιλτιάδης ὁ Κίμωνος ἐτησιέων ἀνέμων κατεστηκότων νηὶ κατανύσας ἐξ Ἐλαιοῦντος τοῦ ἐν Χερσονήσῳ ἐς Λῆμνον προηγόρευε ἐξιέναι ἐκ τῆς νήσου τοῖσι Πελασγοῖσι, ἀναμιμνήσκων σφέας τὸ χρηστήριον, τὸ οὐδαμὰ ἤλπισαν σφίσι οἱ Πελασγοὶ ἐπιτελέεσθαι. Ἡφαιστιέες μέν νυν ἐπείθοντο,

---

14. **πρὸς νότον πολλόν**, about 140 miles. Rawlinson thinks a trireme might have achieved the voyage *αὐτημερόν*, but not *βορέῃ ἀνέμῳ*. Mr. Tozer (*Islands of the Aegean*, p. 236) reports the interesting observation that with a north wind the current of the Hellespont sets with great force towards Lemnos, but towards Imbros when the wind is S. Still, one or other of the terms would have been superfluous in the original situation, when *ὑμετέρη* stood for Attica: and *βορέῃ ἀνέμῳ* has the more primitive look.

140. 1. **ἔτεσι δὲ κάρτα πολλοῖσι.** About 500 according to the ordinary computation. The chronological and other relations between the Persian acquisition of Lemnos (5. 26 *supra*) and the 'Athenian,' are not stated, nor is the problem present to the mind of Hdt., the two stories being told in different connexions, and from different sources: but, if the voyage of Miltiades was subsequent to the visitation of Otanes, then it may have been from the Persians that Miltiades wrested the island. But see *infra*. The case is a fresh illustration of the use made for political purposes of the mythical and legendary traditions. Cp. c. 138. l. 6 *supra*.

3. **ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίοισι.** Athenian vanity (Blakesley) represents the occupation of the Chersonese by the Philaids as done for Athens. But cp. cc. 36, 39 *supra*, and Appendix IV. § 9. Whatever the motive, the result was practically as vanity might have desired. Perhaps this acquisition of Lemnos 'for the Athenians' had already done duty at the first trial of Miltiades. But cp. cc. 104, 136 *supra*. It is impossible to follow Blakesley (note *ad l.*) in referring the passage which he quotes from Charax (*apud* Steph. Byz. *sub v.* *Ἡφαιστία*) to a surrender of the city of Hephaistia by Miltiades to the Athenians. Hdt. seems to imply that Hephaistia surrendered and that Myrina afterwards stood a siege. Steph. Byz. drawing on Charax records that Myrina was besieged and captured and that Hephaistia then surrendered. By an emendation of Valckenaer's, Hermon is made tyrant of Hephaistia and surrenders it. The date of the annexation is to be placed during the Ionian revolt (*pace* Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen*, p. 16). Cp. 5. 26 *supra*. But the island of course passed again out of the control of Athens, or of Miltiades, cp. c. 31 *supra*, and Lemnians served in the fleet of Xerxes, though the Athenian connexion was not without effect, cp. 8. 11. Later, the connexion with Lemnos and Imbros became specially close. (Cp. Tozer, *op. cit.* pp. 237 f.)

4. **Ἐλαιοῦντος.** On the extreme south-(west) point of the Chersonese. Strabo, 331, fr. 52 (ed. Teubn. ii. p. 470): only about 40 stadia distant from Sigeion in the Troad.

6. **τὸ χρηστήριον.** It was rather the *ὑπόληψις* of their ancestors which should have been kept in mind. On *ἀναμιμνήσκειν τινά τι*, cp. L. & S. *sub v.*

7. **Ἡφαιστιέες . . Μυριναῖοι.** Hephaistia and Myrina were the two towns on the island, N. and W., the former named after the god to whom the volcanic Lemnos was sacred (cp. *Il.* 1. 594). Myrina, however (the modern Kastro), "occupies a striking position which marks it out as the natural capital of the island" (Tozer, *op. c.* p. 240). The only remains of the town now, "a splendid piece of *cyclopean* masonry" (*ib.* p. 246). The position of Hephaistia, Tozer observes p. 268, was convenient for commerce, but not defensively strong. It appears in the Athenian Tribute-lists to have paid nearly twice as much as Myrina (not to be confused with Myrina by Kyme). On the traditional volcanic claims of Lemnos, consult Tozer, *op. c.*

Μυριναῖοι δὲ οὐ συγγινωσκόμενοι εἶναι τὴν Χερσόνησον Ἀττικὴν ἐπολιορκέοντο, ἐς ὃ καὶ οὗτοι παρέστησαν. οὕτω δὴ τὴν Λῆμνον ἔσχον Ἀθηναῖοί τε καὶ Μιλτιάδης.

---

9. **οὕτω δή.** The story of the acquisition of Lemnos by the Athenians is introduced by Hdt. with extraordinary skill, for an artistic purpose. (1) After the miserable end of the (reputed) victor of Marathon these more heroic incidents restore tone and cheer to the narrative. (2) The story gives Hdt. an opportunity for a Parthian shot at Hekataios, to whom he has been a good deal more indebted in these Books than appears on the surface. (3) The story forms an absolute pause in the general course of the main history, and an emphatic break between the sixth and seventh Books as we have them. As the whole work closes with a biographical anecdote (9. 122) which serves at once to sum up the moral of the great war (Bks. 7, 8, 9) and to link the end with the beginning in the person of Kyros, so does Hdt. close this part of his work, the second of his three volumes, with a passage which emphasises the superiority of truly Hellenic (Attic) culture over the cruelty and roughness of uncivilisation, to the description of which so much of this volume has been devoted. If such things are accidental, they are accidents of genius. Cp. Introduction, § 3.

END OF VOL. I

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh*